

EDINBURGH .

PRINTED BY T. CONSTABLE, PRINTER TO HER MAJESTY .

THE
NORTH BRITISH REVIEW.

NOVEMBER 1850—FEBRUARY 1851.

VOL. XVIII

EDINBURGH :
W. P. KENNEDY, SOUTH ST. ANDREW STREET ;
LONDON : HAMILTON, ADAMS, AND CO. ;
DUBLIN : JAMES M'GLASHAN,

MDCCLII.

THE
NORTH BRITISH REVIEW.

NOVEMBER, 1852.

ART. I.—*Report of Her Majesty's Commissioners appointed to inquire into the State, Discipline, Studies, and Revenues of the University and Colleges of Oxford; together with the Evidence, and an Appendix.* London, 1852.

Two years ago we reviewed the history, existing condition, and future prospects of the University of Oxford, on the occasion of the appointment of the Royal Commission of Inquiry. That Commission has now laid the result of its labours before Parliament and the public, in the shape of a Blue Book of more than 700 pages. The document appeared at a time of happy omen for the abolition of old things and the introduction of new. The late House of Commons was drawing its last legislative breath, while the arraigned University was witnessing the close of another academical year—an epoch which, like similar periods in that individual life which is regarded as so exact a parallel to the existence of corporations, may be charitably supposed to be sacred to self-examination and resolutions of amendment. National representatives *in posse*, and collegiate authorities *in esse* have alike had the opportunity of devoting a portion of their summer leisure to the study of a work which may be sport to the one or death to the other. Before these pages reach our readers one of the two bodies, if not both, will have met for the despatch of business—summoned by the inexorable requirements of University routine, or the more capricious dictates of Lord Derby's sense of decency. But whenever Parliament may assemble, the temporary pressure of political perplexities, no less than the invariable slowness of Oxford movements, is a sufficient guarantee to us that nothing will have been done by either to supersede

any comments which we may venture to offer on the aspect of the question as viewed from within or from without.

Though the proceedings of judicial Westminster and dependent Oxford are still *in dubio*, there is, we believe, no doubt that the Report has been well received. Even the more advanced section of the Liberal press has spoken of it as forming a favourable exception to the vacillation and feebleness of most of our parliamentary literature—even the prejudice of High Church journalism admits that it is able and well-considered, and acquits it of the charge of one-sidedness in dealing with the evidence given. It is of course not to be expected that the microscopic gaze of the elder Conservative residents should not have discovered some flaws, intellectual as well as moral, in a document affecting their interests, yet not emanating from themselves in whole or in part. Nor can we wonder that the publication should provoke the unfriendly criticism of one or two doubtful Reformers who are disappointed not to have been able to influence the direction of the inquiry. But on the whole, both friends and foes seem agreed that it is a work of high character and great importance, to be carefully weighed, not summarily dismissed. We should have been surprised if the most casual reader had come to any other conclusion. At the first glance it is evident that the Commissioners have a thorough acquaintance with their subject, both in its history and in its philosophy; that while they know, as Oxford men, what is now going on in Oxford, and as historical students, what has been found possible there in former times, they are not blind to those less limited visions which represent an ideal but seldom contemplated by English minds—the University of the Future. But it is not to the authors of the Report alone that the public has to render its acknowledgments. One half at least of the bulky folio is occupied with the evidence of other members of the University; and the proportion holds good no less morally than materially. More than fifty gentlemen of academical station and recognised ability have come forward to state their views on a number of questions, indicated by the Commissioners as those on which it was most important that the general sense of men of enlightenment should be ascertained; and there is besides much direct testimony to special facts by persons officially qualified to speak, such as professors and tutors of colleges. The result is, that the country has been presented with a collection, as complete as could have been made under the circumstances, of pamphlets on University matters by the best authors, especially addressed to readers of the year 1852. These, as might be supposed, are in many cases distinguished by striking ability, and that not always in direct proportion to the reputation enjoyed by the various

writers in the world without; so that the further advantage is gained of familiarizing people with the names of men who have hitherto deserved rather than attained notoriety. The past experience of the Archbishop of Dublin, though unfolded with characteristic acuteness, shews less of comprehensive observation and mature reflection than the present impressions of Mr. Jowett. Or to take an instance of men, both of whom have long been absent from the University, Mr. Wilkinson, the unknown Rector of Broughton Gifford, Wilts, has meditated on the condition of his Alma Mater with much more profit than Mr. Herman Merivale, late Professor of Political Economy, and Under Secretary for the Colonies. It is pleasanter, however, to award praise directly than to leave it to be inferred from invidious comparisons. Professor Vaughan's academical celebrity did not require any additional support; but we would thank him most warmly for the profound thought, austere enthusiasm, and lofty eloquence, which would commend his evidence to general attention, even if regarded merely as a piece of composition. The rare judgment and practical power shown in Mr Temple's elaborate and systematic exposition will satisfy the public that it is fortunate in having secured the services of such a man as Principal of the Training College at Kneller Hall. Those whose attention has been attracted to the unfortunate disputes at Lincoln College, recently made matter of publicity, will now see how greatly the intellectual character of the Society might have been benefited by the elevation of Mr. Pattison to the Rectorship. Mr. Wall's answers will enable practical men out of Oxford to judge of the ability and zeal which are making Balliol College as pre-eminent economically as it has long been intellectually and socially. Nor ought we to forget the brief but decisive statement in which Mr. Lowe, the new member for Kidderminster, disposes of certain educational fallacies which yet haunt the mind of the University. There is beside a considerable variety of dissertations on special points. Mr. Denison contributes some valuable remarks on the propriety and possibility of fostering the study of law in Oxford, and Dr. Acland does the same for medicine. Mr. Neate, on the other hand, brings his legal knowledge to bear on the questions of the permanent obligation of founders' wills, and the management of College property; while the indefatigable Mr. Wilkinson adds a postscript on the visitatorial power of the Crown over the University, which proves that he might have made an excellent lawyer himself. But it is the merit of the whole collection, rather than that of its several parts, which constitutes, in our view, its chief claim to attention. As we turn over its pages, we feel that one thing at least is demonstrated indisputably—

that the principles and objects, as well as the multifarious details, of University education, are in the main thoroughly understood by Oxford men in the nineteenth century. Educators, recluse students, and men of the world, have combined to produce a work which England can present to Paris or Heidelberg, in the confidence that it will be received with respect, even by those whose superiority in some essential points it frankly acknowledges. We feel that if the Academical citadel be susceptible of defence against the anti-educational influences of the day, there is no lack of hands to defend it. Nay, we doubt whether Oxford conservatism could vindicate itself better than by pointing to this very Blue Book, and insisting on the fact that the old system has been found capable of producing so much intellect, knowledge, and energy, as are now engaged in pleading for its reformation.

In passing on to a closer examination of the Report, we shall not be required to bestow an equal share of notice on every part of it. Much space is naturally devoted to a historical account of the University and the Colleges, which we can safely recommend to our readers as sufficiently clear, vigorous, and complete. To enter upon this, however, would be only to repeat a considerable part of our former Article, as the general results aimed at by the Commissioners, are, we are happy to say, the same as our own, and our limits will not allow us to lose any time in the by-ways of antiquarian detail. Neither will it be necessary to reiterate any of the conclusions which appeared to follow as practical corollaries from our view of the past, to prove again that the Universities are national, and that College property is not private property. It is a satisfaction to have a regular legal statement like Mr. Dampier's on the subject of collegiate trusts, as an answer to those who prefer the letter to the spirit of the constitution; but little good would be done by attempting an analysis of it for the benefit of persons already convinced that proved abuses are their own condemnation. We purpose, then, at once to dismiss all that has reference to the principle of the inquiry, both as having already received such consideration as it was in our power to give, and as being virtually settled by the institution of an inquiry at all, and so to occupy ourselves with the only part which can in our judgment be fairly made a matter of debate in or out of Parliament, the superstructure of practical suggestions resting on the admitted hypothesis of University and Collegiate reform.

The first recommendation of the Commissioners, as might be surmised, is, that the University be relieved from the chains in which, two hundred years ago, it was bound hand and foot by the serpent wisdom of Laud. What is the precise extent of its

present bondage is indeed not absolutely clear. In 1759 the Heads of Houses were desirous of altering one of the Laudian statutes, and found no difficulty in getting lawyers to assure them that no act of the University could possibly have deprived it of a privilege once belonging to it. But the eminent counsel of 1759, like the eminent counsel of 1851, failed to remove the scruples of men who asserted that the opinion, however consolatory in the abstract, did not meet the precise facts of the case. At any rate, a directly contrary opinion was given in 1836 by Lord (then Sir John) Campbell, and Dr. Lushington, who declared that in depriving Dr. Hampden of the rights secured to the Regius Professor of Divinity by the Laudian Code, the University had, in the eye of the law, forfeited its charter. The practice of the University, it appears, has been a singular attempt at compromise, analogous to the policy which the Colleges have observed with regard to their own statutes. Three of the Laudian statutes have been detached from the rest and treated as inviolable, while the others have been explained, dispensed with, and even abrogated at pleasure—a distinction for which the Commissioners profess themselves unable to discover any authority. Under these circumstances they suggest that steps should be taken to ascertain the legal position of the University, and that, if necessary, indemnity should be granted for the past and liberty for the future. If there be any prudence in the academical mind, we do not see how this suggestion can be regarded as otherwise than well-timed. The best course for Oxford in general may be to remain quiet and avoid public notice; but it must surely be more advisable to accept an obligation from the English Parliament, than to run the risk of a crushing collision with the English Law.

This antecedent disability removed, the thing which comes first under question is the academical constitution itself. Of the three insurmountable statutes that which establishes the government of the University of course is one. Unchanged itself, the Hebdomadal Board has been the arbiter of all change—of the many corruptions which the lapse of two centuries and the decay of learning and enthusiasm have introduced, and of the few remedies which have been applied to meet the disease. And now at last, when it is put on its trial before the University which it has governed so long, its condemnation is all but unanimous. The one exception proves the rule most unmistakably. "It is, however," the Commissioners gravely say, "that of an eminent man who is himself a member of the governing body," a sentence adroitly worded, so as to leave it doubtful whether the meaning is that an eminent man is more or less entitled to a hearing on account of the position which has at once given him

a personal knowledge of the system and a personal interest in maintaining it. Doubtless, however, all the other Heads of Houses, if they could or would speak, would assure the world that the University has no chance of getting on without them. The ominous silence of Dr. Macbride, the only other member of the Board who has found a tongue, may be owing to unexpressed reforming predilections, but it may also be set down to the good taste of his conservatism. But whatever may be the feelings of the shepherds, the voice of the sheep is sonorous and unequivocal. It has had its effect on the Commissioners, one of whom, it must not be forgotten, is, like Dr. Cardwell, "an eminent man, who is himself a member of the governing body." We do not find that Dr. Jeune absented himself from the meetings of the Commission during this part of their deliberations, as was done by one of his colleagues, on a subsequent occasion, to avoid the operation of personal bias; so full credit ought to be given for the value of his adhesion. When we read (Report, pp. 11, 12) that "it is anomalous that the government of this great institution should be committed to persons, the great majority of whom are elected by the fellows of the separate colleges out of their own narrow circle, often for reasons of a personal or social nature, and with little or no regard to the welfare of the University," and, "more anomalous still, that the literary interests of the University should be committed to persons who are not necessarily chosen for literary qualifications," it is important to recollect that these are words in which the instinctive sentiment of the unprivileged many is ratified by the deliberate judgment of one of the privileged few.

After this unprecedented concurrence of opinion, sanctioned by authority so unimpeachable, we may be spared the necessity of arguing against the Hebdomadal Board. It constitutes, in fact, the climax of the great corruption of Oxford, the superseding of the University by the Colleges, though the advocates of the collegiate system are second to none in their expressions of hostility to this last development of the usurpation which they so strenuously abet. But while the evil is palpable, the cure, as the Commissioners themselves feel, is not so clear. Wisely, in our opinion, they reject the simplest of the expedients proposed—that of "investing Convocation with the right of debating and of amending all propositions submitted to its vote." So far from it, they would abridge the powers already possessed by that unruly and unenlightened body. We have since been told that "the shutting up of the great council" imperils "the heritage of Alfred and de Montfort;" but these magniloquent antiquarianisms fail to convince us of the desirableness of encumbering the academical legislature with a large body of persons in most cases

originally incompetent, and further disqualified by lengthened absence from the place which is to be affected by their legislation. The Universities, as things now stand, are far too liberal in conferring a degree which ought to be a certificate of real merit; but as it is the country which is mainly in fault, so it is the country which mainly suffers by the lowering of the standard. But the disgrace becomes flagrant and cruel injustice when this indiscriminate assemblage of graduates is summoned to Oxford to neutralize and overwhelm the *bona fide* votes of distinguished men actively employed on the spot—to throw out a statute which nine-tenths of them would be puzzled to explain, or to degrade a theologian for an elaborate work known to them only by a few garbled extracts, and even those imperfectly apprehended. It is not a question of universal suffrage, of the Braintree rabble *versus* Major Beresford, strange as it would be that the Tory University should set so high a value on the popular voice. The masses of England are directly interested in the leading questions of English politics; they are alive to the imposition of taxes, and naturally anxious about their appropriation. But the masses of Oxford cannot be said to be concerned in a system with the working of which they have nothing whatever to do, and to the support of which, in spite of their slender yearly payments, they will not venture to pretend that they contribute anything. As members of the nation, they may justly claim to exercise a certain general control over the seats of national education; but that is already secured to them in Parliament and in public opinion. The cause of Convocation is not the cause of academical self-government, but the reverse—the cause of interference from without, and that not by a qualified functionary, but by a miscellaneous multitude—a thing to which the worst democracies, so far as we know, supply no parallel. Nothing, we fear, short of a *coup d'état* could sweep it away altogether: but we hail with delight any measure which tends to counteract its injurious efficiency. However, the only alternative is not between this reactionary ochlocracy and the “stable oligarchy of the Hebdomadal Board.” It has been proposed to regenerate the Board itself either by enlargement or by diminution—by infusing new blood, or by lopping off useless limbs. But the Commissioners feel, and we think with justice, that neither plan would answer the desired end—the one as involving the evil of frequent elections, as the additions made would naturally consist of a selection from the tutors and professors; the other as making an invidious and possibly inefficacious distinction, while it would leave the grievances of the unrepresented residents wholly unredressed. Accordingly they suggest a *tertium quid* in the shape of a restoration of Congregation, the

assembly of regents, which, as we explained formerly, was once a living reality, and is now an existing nullity. As regency now implies not teaching but simply juniority of standing, this body of course has to undergo reconstitution as well as emancipation. It is suggested that it should consist of the heads of houses and proctors, the professors and public lecturers, (a class which, as we shall see, the Report proposes considerably to increase,) and the senior tutor of each College. This assembly is to meet not regularly but by special summons, on the requisition of the heads, or of a certain number of its own members, and to deliberate in English on such matters as fall within the province of the University. The Hebdomadal Board is to remain, independently of its position in Congregation, for the purpose apparently of transacting administrative business, and of exercising the initiative just mentioned. Convocation, too, is to remain, in its present condition of a Lower House, receiving and (if it pleases) rejecting but not discussing bills, and electing the chancellor and the burgesses, though not the professors. This clemency, as we have said, we are inclined to grudge: nor do we sympathize with that which continues to the Hebdomadal Board an abbreviated authority. It is true that heads of Colleges, if deprived of their university functions, would find a large part of their occupation gone, and their offices would in consequence fall considerably as objects of ambition; but this cannot be helped, if indeed it would not be a positive advantage. The influence which the Commissioners would leave them is somewhat indeterminate; but we see no medium between an oppressive fact and an unmeaning fiction. We think, too, there is some academical pedantry in the notion of formally reviving an institution which has been a *caput mortuum* since the Reformation, as if it were absolutely necessary to shew a historical precedent for a change clearly good in itself, as if such precedents, when not followed literally, but strained to admit large modifications, could really be said to retain any appreciable historical value. Prudence, indeed, may sanction such nominal revivals, as concessions to scrupulous lawyers or timid Conservatives; but, on the other hand, they have a fatal tendency to encourage, what in Oxford needs no encouragement, that distrust of new remedies which, as Bacon remarks, is the surest way of incurring new diseases. Still, it is well to be thankful for what we can get; so we will not quarrel with the boon of Congregation either for its name or for its concomitants, but accept it in the hope that the old form may prove a new power, strong enough to control the two most uncongenial elements which are still suffered to co-exist with it.

The discipline of the University is the natural pendant to its

administration. This question, as treated by the Commissioners, is a very wide one, embracing not only the condition of the present race of students, and the means of acting on them, but the whole subject of University Extension. The former part of it, however, though infinitely difficult to grapple with in practice, necessarily shrinks to a more moderate compass on paper. The more obvious kinds of mechanical restraint are already in force. The proctors preserve external decency, and cut off a certain proportion of facilities for temptation. The collegiate system, if good for nothing else, succeeds in securing to a small extent the personal supervision which is realized by boarding houses at schools. Hence with regard to two out of the three evils especially noted, sensual vice, gambling, and extravagance, the Commissioners have little to offer beyond a stereotyped exhortation to greater vigilance, which is tantamount to saying that no great diminution of their present amount is to be expected. The first of them, indeed, is merely a single aspect of an enormous social problem which, though daily becoming more and more urgent, scarcely any one ventures to approach: still we think that, without any breach of delicacy, it might have been spoken of more fully both in the Report and in the Evidence, if it were only to shew that the Commissioners, and others interested in education, had reflected on the subject, and felt its difficulty. But about extravagance there is a good deal more to be said. The respectable public has of late years become awake to the fact, that to have a son hampered with college debts is exceedingly inconvenient, and it not unnaturally asks, Why cannot University and College authorities stop it? In deference to this cry, the Commissioners enter at considerable length into a question which, as it seems to us, they do not themselves regard as a very profitable one. They even venture to suggest that the Legislature might do something by enacting, that no debt shall be recoverable from a minor *in statu pupillari*, unless the bills shall have been sent in within a certain time to the pupil, and, if necessary, to his tutor. Another of their remedies, though classed by them as indirect, strikes us as much more to the purpose—the summary removal of idle and extravagant students. But then comes the pinch, Would the respectable public support the authorities in taking such stringent measures? in other words, Would it be wise enough to see that the less promising part of the rising generation must be sacrificed to save the rest? We fear not. “Ces pères de famille sont capables de tout:” and though ready enough to speak of their grievances as a class, they feel and act as individuals. Some would talk of cruelty and injustice, others of ill-judged and impertinent interference. And if the result were, as it probably would be, a visible dimi-

nution of numbers even in the most flourishing Colleges, would principals and vice-principals have the strength of mind to perceive that this failure was probably temporary, to be followed by a return of public confidence equal in quantity and increased in quality a hundred fold, and that in any case their duty to the youth of England is to be performed not by lowering themselves to its standard, but by raising it to theirs? We suspect that the Committee of Heads of Houses in 1846, in declaring that little would be done by direct interference, was not sorry to discourage an activity which might lead to unpleasant consequences. "*Malumus regnum vastatum esse quam damnatum,*" is a hard saying—perhaps more than can be expected from any whose convictions are not of equal strength with the bigotry that originally uttered it. Yet Arnold was found to declare, that while it was not necessary that Rugby should be a school of 300, or 100, or 50 boys, it was necessary that it should be a school of Christian gentlemen; and it would be humiliating to think that such sentiments were utterly unknown to the officials of his own University. Certainly no better answer could be given to the complaints of parents than the announcement of a resolution to purify the College atmosphere till it could be safely breathed by the weak and inexperienced. The onus would then be thrown on society, which would have to bear it as it best might. Meantime there is one recommendation of the Commissioners, which, supported as it is by the great bulk of the evidence, will, we trust, encounter but little opposition—the abolition of all academical distinctions of rank and wealth. After ages will hardly credit, that up to 1852, Oxford so far encouraged some of the worst tendencies of the English character, as to accept extra fees from as many of its students as thought it worth their while to go to the expense, and grant them in return a measure of exemption from that moral and intellectual discipline which, on general grounds, she declared to be essential.

On the subject of University extension our own opinions have already been expressed too fully to need repetition. It must be confessed, however, that both the Report of the Commissioners and the great body of the evidence are decidedly against us. When we are despondent they are sanguine. We do not wish to underrate the importance of such an accumulated weight of testimony. But we should have thought more highly of it if it had obviously been given after a deliberate consideration of the arguments that present themselves on the other side. We never disguised from ourselves that on this point we were dissenters from the catholic faith of University reformers; we only felt that we had protestant reasons to render for our dissidence. Thus, when we find that neither the Commissioners nor the

mass of their supporters appear to have been sensible of the difficulties which struck us as not only grave but insuperable, we can hardly think our position altered from what it was in November 1850. Mr. Clough, late Fellow and Tutor of Oriel College, and afterwards Principal of the new Hall in connexion with the London University, is the only one whose adhesion to the orthodox belief seems to be based on a full consciousness that there are two sides to the question. But against his testimony we may set off that of Mr. Mansel, Fellow and Tutor of St. John's College, whose views as nearly as possible coincide with those hazarded by ourselves. No allusion is made to this part of his evidence in the Report: while Mr. Clough, though quoted at length, as having "well argued the whole question," is appealed to, not in answer to objections actual or possible, but simply in confirmation of a sentiment assumed to be universally prevalent. We will give such extracts from the arguments of both these gentlemen as may enable our readers to judge of them positively as well as comparatively.

After stating the presumption which the increase of commercialism affords against the success of any attempt to extend the University, Mr. Clough proceeds,—

"Though there certainly is a good deal of reluctance to allow much time for education before business, yet it seems to be true that the opposite feeling gains ground. If fathers are on one side, mothers are on the other. It is not uncommon for a merchant to send his son abroad, after leaving school, for a year's experience of the world. The apprenticeship both for solicitors and merchants, it is said, might be abridged with advantage. Indefinite fears of extravagant and dissipated courses, the notion of unfit habits and ideas and useless studies and tastes, would undoubtedly operate long enough to make the change extremely gradual. But if those fears are, as I believe them to be, exaggerated, and that notion only half true, experience would surely, however gradually, lessen the former and modify the latter. The sphere which already includes the London banker would presently be extended over other commercial classes. More and more young men, sons of the more affluent parents, destined for business, would be brought under the influence of the ancient rational education. There would perhaps be a pressure for earlier admission than is now usual. Yet the data of University or King's College, London, must not be overstrained. They prove, perhaps, that classical and mathematical instruction, even when modified for modern views, is not a sufficient attraction. But Oxford and Cambridge have others. On the whole, I venture to conclude that there are a great many young men who ought to come to the old Universities, and who would come. What keeps them away is, I believe, rather the want of confidence than the actual amount of expense. Single colleges, I am told, in which confidence is felt, are applied to

by numbers, who, if refused admission there, do not come to the University at all. I would suggest to Her Majesty's Commissioners the analogy of the public schools. Twenty years ago somewhat of a similar feeling prevailed respecting them. May not the next twenty years as greatly extend the University system as the last have the public schools? I do not at all say that these as they now are are perfect, but they are extensively useful; and any change which experience shall prove to be needed will not knock at those doors altogether hopelessly. The vessel is in motion, and its course may be guided. And certainly, if I may judge by personal recollections of the conduct of that change, during what may be called its eight first years, under the most vigorous and effective of the reconstructing hands, a good deal of unfearing experimentation may and should in such cases be hazarded."—*Evidence*, pp. 212, 213, quoted in *Report*, p. 97.

On the other hand, Mr. Mansel says,—

"I do not think that any great scheme of University extension is practicable in the present day. The whole current of society appears to be setting in an opposite direction. In an age of great competition of all trades and professions, few parents will send a son to spend three years at the University in the general enlargement of his mind, when he might be concentrating his faculties in his own business in the office, the counting-house, or the surgery. It gives his competitors too great a start in the race of life. Nor would this be in any great degree obviated by making University education more professional. The University must undertake to supply all the technical details of each special apprenticeship, or she will be unable to compete with any as a training-school for money-making. Such a teaching of technicalities is not desirable, and, what is more to the purpose, it is not practicable: the working part of every business will be best learned on the spot where it is exercised. Even as regards theoretical study, I believe that the minute cultivation of special departments of knowledge is as incompatible with the local grouping of all on the same spot, as with the possession of universal information by a single mind. A study, to be cultivated with real zeal, must be the study of the place. Each separate branch tends in its progress to acquire, not merely its own special devotees, but its own special locality. If the whole tendency of the age is to education as the means of earning a living, if, relatively to that purpose, practical experience is everything, and if centralization of all branches of knowledge is not the best means of gaining practical experience in one only, general University extension is in this respect a backward, not a forward step. . . . The Church is about the only profession to which the above remarks do not apply; partly because clerical duties are not, like those of other professions, a direct means of pecuniary competition, and partly because the canonical period fixed for ordination prevents the struggle for an early start in the race of life. And it must be allowed that the tendency of late years has been to make the Universities, in an educational point of view, chiefly a training-school for

clergymen, or for men of fortune who need no profession. In this respect the amount of University extension will be in a great degree regulated by the relations of supply and demand for labour in one particular department. And this has always appeared to me to be the weak point in the demand so frequently heard of late of very cheap education for very poor men. The question is frequently argued as if the B.A. degree were the end of a man's natural, as it generally is of his academical, life. Were this the case it might be a worthy object of every exertion to secure for him such a glorious euthanasia. But the further question remains, what can you do with your man when you have educated him? Is it real charity to fit him for one walk only in life, to give him much general cultivation of mind, but little special means of bread-making; to turn him out too poor to associate with his equals in culture, too cultivated to associate with his equals in purse? Will Church extension meet the supply? and are very poor curates the most desirable or the only practicable means of Church extension? or is it expedient or practicable to introduce, as is largely the case in Germany, a body of family tutorships as a provision for poor scholars; in other words, to combine on a large scale the education of a gentleman with the condition of a servant? And will not the victim occasionally wish that dignity had been sacrificed to comfort, and that he had been sent behind the counter?"—*Evidence*, pp. 19, 20.

In one respect Mr. Clough's opinion is the more valuable of the two, as being presumably the result of a more extensive experience, the judgment of one who knows London as well as Oxford. We suspect, however, that distance lends enchantment to his view of the prospects of his original Alma Mater. Against the fact of an undeniable tendency he has little to offer beyond surmises and possibilities. The analogy of the public schools, to which he appeals, will not carry him very far. Their history during the last twenty years proves that it is possible to introduce with success considerable changes into an old established system of instruction, supposing external circumstances to be favourable. But this supposition is precisely what in the case of the Universities we are not entitled to make. There was nothing to prevent a reform in the public schools but the feelings of those who were attached to the *status quo*. If the reactionary process has already commenced, as we grieve to think that it has, in the very head-quarters of improvement,—Arnold's own school of Rugby,—that is owing not to any irresistible obstacles existing in the nature of things, but simply and solely to a change of dynasty, such as may be brought about any day by a body of conservative trustees. Boys intended for business could be sent to public schools so soon as their parents became convinced that the instruction to be got there would be useful and not merely ornamental. Some might remain at school

during the whole of the usual time, and others could be withdrawn earlier, whenever an opening for them could be found elsewhere. But it does not follow, that because our future merchants and manufacturers can be spared from the counting-house or the factory till the age of sixteen, or even nineteen, they are to be tempted by any amount of educational or economical reform to defer their entry into life to their twenty-second or twenty-third year. On the contrary, it is obvious that where the demands of a school are complied with reluctantly, those of a University are sure to be refused altogether. The fact is, that, as Mr. Griffiths remarks, (*Evidence*, p. 202,) our public schools have taken the place and do the work of what our Universities were in former times, so that an argument from the success of the one to that of the other is not only inconsequent but absolutely suicidal. The instance of the London bankers only proves that men whose fortunes are assured can afford to exempt their sons, to a certain extent, from that competition to which the less favoured have to submit. But those are surely exceptional cases in which a man of business can hope to hold his own by mere hereditary right, like a landowner or a member of a Whig cabinet. Since our last article appeared Mr. Cobden has told the people of Manchester what sort of education it is that the nature and opportunities of manufacturing life will allow. Standard works are to give place to periodicals, *Thucydides* to the *Times*. Can our rulers believe that if he could have been got to furnish evidence to the Commissioners, his estimate of the literary leisure of the younger portion of his order would have agreed with Mr. Clough's?

But although we think with Mr. Mansel that the vision of an extended University belongs rather to the irrevocable past than to the possible future, we cordially concur in the remedial measures suggested in the report. New halls, private lodgings, connected with or independent of colleges, and admission of strangers to professorial lectures, are improvements which will suit Oxford as it is, no less than Oxford as it will be. The College monopoly, as the Commissioners appear to see, is an evil in any case, productive of useless expense, without any counterbalancing advantage: and its destruction is a simple matter of justice to those classes of society already within the academical pale, as well as to those, be they many or few, who are deterred from entering solely by the expense of the academical course. It may be said, indeed, that should no large extension take place, the accommodation already supplied will be amply sufficient; but we can hardly be expected to listen to reasoning which virtually contends that students are to be forced to reside within College walls merely because College walls have been erected

for their reception. Any suggestion for the improvement of the University is surely entitled to a hearing on its own merits, subject to no reservation of the rights of empty buildings or their unprotected proprietors. Let us say then that we admire the magnanimity with which the Commissioners recommend that a fair trial should be given to all of the four plans already referred to, simply on account of the evidence with which each is supported, though themselves doubting the feasibility of one or two of the number. It is only by such a spirit of liberal concession that the cause of reform can possibly be advanced in these days, when the dissatisfaction of years has to find expression in a moment, and every sufferer draws on his own experience for a universal remedy. Oxford is now in the position of Germany in 1848; no Parliamentary Government has taught it the measure of political practicability; its soundest and best thinkers have never felt that they could secure the carrying of even the most common-sense proposition by the strength of ordinary combination, much less by the mere force of reason: and the only thing to be wondered at is, that a manifesto representing so great a variety of floating opinion should contain so little individual crotchet. In the present instance, we think the simultaneous development of rival schemes may prove to be not only necessary, but positively beneficial. Even where they encroach on each other's sphere, the public may reap advantage from the competition. Existing side by side, they may tend to neutralize each other's defects.

We have no great affection for the project of a hall for poor students, as we believe that the line of demarcation thus introduced would be equally injurious to the poor and the rich, impressing the former with a daily sense of social inferiority, and confirming the latter in any habits of indolence or insolence which they may have formed already. But the evil would be mitigated if the cheap hall were to present itself as one out of many means of avoiding expense, so that the choice might not lie between avaricious frugality and collegiate extravagance. On other grounds nothing, as we conceive, can be said against restoring to the academical body the liberty of opening fresh halls. The enactment which took away the right seems to have been passed for the benefit of the Chancellor, whose power it helped to consolidate; but the purposes which it has really secured have been those of the College oligarchy. The question as it stands now is in effect that of the voluntary system against an effete establishment. The same cause which engages the interests of inferior men in support of the existing monopoly makes really able and energetic persons anxious for its abolition. They would far rather trust to their own powers of attracting students than to the prestige of an

institution which, whatever its endowments, must always seem to them more or less hampered and paralyzed. The complaint indeed may be met in a much more obvious way by a reform of the Colleges themselves, such as, we shall see, the Commissioners proceed to propose. But though it would have been absurd for them, in their position, with an unlimited power of suggestion, to attempt to compass their object otherwise than directly, it is but common prudence in us to remind our readers that changes are seldom effected wholesale, and that a large portion of a reformer's work will generally be in the counteraction rather than in the removal of evils. As for affiliated halls, supplementary to the several Colleges, it is hardly worth while to waste a word in their defence. As the Commissioners remark, they would be mere extensions of the parent societies, so that no objection on the ground of principle can possibly apply to them. Difficulties of detail, such as want of funds, and want of building ground, are palpably matters of consideration for the Colleges which are ambitious of so extending themselves. It might be a question whether they should be obliged to found halls; but nothing can be said against repealing any statute which forbids them to do so. The real obstacle which would probably prevent the reception of such a proposal by the present governors of Oxford, the jealousy felt by the inferior Colleges, which owe their continuance in any shape mainly to the limitations imposed on the development of their more meritorious rivals, can be powerful only so long as it is not openly avowed. Lodgings in connexion with Colleges are another expedient which may be rapidly dismissed. The apprehension of a relaxed discipline is the only objection, and that may, perhaps, be worth something. Cambridge, where, if we mistake not, about half the students of the larger Colleges reside in lodgings, is commonly reputed to be less moral than Oxford; and from *post hoc* to *propter hoc* is an easy inference. There are, however, some reasons for doubting its validity in the present instance. So far as morality, in the common sense of the term, is promoted by actual restraint, its guardianship is in the hands of the University Proctor, rather than in those of the College Tutor. The necessity of being in doors by midnight, in Mr. Pattison's words, affords no great amount of protection; and that, such as it is, may be secured, though not perfectly, by making the lodging-house keepers responsible to the Colleges for their lodgers. The educational routine of the College would be equally binding on in-door and out-door pupils. On the other hand, the good effects of the Cambridge system are clear and unequivocal. It is sufficient to say that it enables the first College in Europe to double the number of its students.

The next plan recommended in the Report finds its precedent not in Cambridge but in the Scottish and Continental Universities—that of independent lodgings. It is, in fact, a return to the ancient University system, when Colleges were not; and as such, is sure to be vigorously opposed by all whom interest or conviction engages on the side of the existing monopoly. It has, however, the warm approbation of the Commissioners, who evidently expect far greater results from it than from any other project of extension. There can be little doubt that they are right. No better, because no more direct means can be devised for placing an Oxford education within the reach of *all* who may happen to wish for it. We do not believe, as we have said repeatedly, that any large accession is to be expected from classes who are at present excluded not so much by formal enactments, as by the necessities of English life; but there will always be some natures willing to accept education at the risk of a future struggle for existence, and in their case the compulsory expenditure of a College course operates as a real disfranchisement. All that they ask is to be allowed to live in Oxford as they would in any other place, without having to submit to a system not calculated for their special exigencies. For such men a cheap hall might have some advantages, but it would have many drawbacks, independently of the outlay necessary for its establishment. Even the regulations to which the Commissioners propose to subject these lodgings would have to be cautiously applied, so as not to interfere with that private and personal character which belongs to all really economical living. On the other hand, there would be little fear that lodgers of this class would abuse their liberty. The circumstances of their connexion with the University would be a far more efficient safeguard to them than the discipline of College officers, which they would be without, or that of the Proctors, to which they would still be amenable. Permission to live independently in lodgings, the Commissioners naturally presume, would only be granted on special application to the Vice-Chancellor, who might easily command sufficient information as to the antecedents of the applicant. It is merely in accordance with the analogy of ordinary life that the sons of the poor should require, as they receive, less of vigilant superintendence than those of the rich. These considerations, we trust, may serve to quiet the alarms which are already beginning to be expressed at the mere announcement of so revolutionary a proposal.

At any rate, the last point raised by the Commissioners is one at which even timidity itself need not be startled. It appears that persons unconnected with the University are at present allowed to be present at professorial lectures, and even to receive

certificates of attendance, so that all that is needed is that the permission should not be withdrawn when the Professoriate becomes really active, and every subject of knowledge is expounded with the same ability and zeal which is now extended only to two or three.

It may be fairly pleaded, too, that the advocates of University extension have a right to have their disabilities removed. We feel as they do, that practice is the only test of the truth or falsehood of their anticipations; and when what is asked is not protection, but simply freedom to act, it would be the mere prejudice of ultra-conservatism to refuse the request. The following appeal is from one of the most efficient of the tutorial body, Mr. Pattison:—

“Instead of guessing in the dark at the probable effect, [of these plans,] let us make the experiment. Let it not be forgotten that we diverted the Great Western Railway to Didcot, for fear of its bad effects on our discipline. What is urged is not the creation of any new machinery, not that the University should undertake to do any thing more, but that an oppressive restriction should be removed, and the field thrown open to private enterprise and energy. When free, this will speedily run into the best channels. Let us leave halls and colleges, old and new, all with unlimited liberty of admission to work together, and trust to the power of self-adjustment in things which will bring to the surface the capabilities of the several methods. It might be allowed for ten years; nothing will have been done that cannot then be recalled. If the evil now anticipated should be found to result from lodging in the town, we shall then be warranted in recalling the students within the walls, and shall be supported by public opinion in so doing. Or private munificence, or government would then more probably come forward to erect *hospitia* to meet a proved need than to provide for a probable one. It might be found that both methods (*i.e.*, halls and lodging out) would work well *together*, as accommodating different classes of persons. There would always be found persons who would be willing to pay the existing high rates for the advantages they believe to attach to domestication under our roofs; while all that class who cannot afford £120 to £130 per annum, but who could afford from £60 to £80, would, by this single enactment, be admitted to the general benefits of University education. It is incumbent, indeed, on a University to be cautious and deliberate in all its proceedings. But experiments are not necessarily rash—there are wise ones; there are even wise experiments in legislation which do not answer, and then to desist from them involves no disgrace. On the other hand, nothing would be more feeble than for us to emerge from this crisis of opinion with a scheme of paltry reforms. A great measure vindicates itself, and helps its own success. The present is a moment which may be made very decisive. I would earnestly press, not indeed the more comprehensive measure that one could wish for—for that the public mind, either in the University or the country, is not prepared—but such an

extension as will at least set agitation on that subject at rest for some years to come. We in Oxford are weary of scheming, suggesting, and pamphleteering. Give us leave to be doing something. Untie our hands, and open our gates, and let us at least try if we can attract here, and can usefully deal with that large circle of youth whom we are told we ought to have here. If only a little relaxation is given us, and if then our numbers do not increase, it will be impossible to avoid ascribing that to the usual abortiveness of half measures. But, indeed, the utmost that is now asked for is truly little. The ideal of a national university is that it should be co-extensive with the nation—it should be the common source of all the higher (or secondary) instruction for the country; but the proposed measure would, after all, only go part of the way towards making it co-extensive with that part of the nation which supports the Established Church.”—*Evidence*, pp. 43, 44.

Whatever we may think of University extension, we cannot doubt that it is the interest of Oxford to place herself in the hands of men of this stamp. Their labours may be fatal to sinecures and monopolies, but they will not injure anything that is worth preserving. Ten years of their failures will do more for the University and the country, than ten years of the greatest success which can be attained in these days by the organized imbecility of a collegiate oligarchy.

- We ought not to omit to mention that the Commissioners glance in passing at another sort of exclusion—that by religious Tests. The general question of the admission of Dissenters is one which they were instructed not to entertain, though several of those who have given evidence condemn the present policy in terms much more decided than those just quoted from Mr. Pattison: but they consider that the particular mode of exclusion comes fairly within the scope of their inquiry in connexion with the morality and discipline of the University. Accordingly, they proceed briefly but emphatically to enumerate their objections to the existing practice of subscription, censuring it as arbitrary, indefinite, and harassing, uncertain in operation, and generally demoralizing. As we wish to imitate their conciseness, we will only copy their conclusion, in which we cordially coincide:—“We do not offer any suggestion as to the manner in which the evil should be remedied; but we must express our conviction that the imposition of subscription, in the manner in which it is now imposed in the University of Oxford, habituates the mind to give a careless assent to truths which it has never considered, and naturally leads to sophistry in the interpretation of solemn obligations.”

• From the taught the Report naturally passes to the teaching

and the teachers. We need not follow it into the history of the old Laudian examination for the B.A. degree, further than to notice an extraordinary statement by the present Hebdomadal Board, who, in their Letter to the Duke of Wellington on the announcement of the Commission, speak of "the academic system of study" as having been "admirably arranged in 1636, at a time when not only the nature and faculties of the human mind were exactly what they are still, and must of course remain, but the principles also of sound and enlarged intellectual culture were far from imperfectly understood." Will our readers believe that this system, within a short time of its establishment, fell into a neglect from which it has never recovered, partly from defects in its provisions, partly from the culpable complicity of the authorities? It is now superseded by another, resembling it neither in the subjects of study, nor in the mode of examination, which, after existing for half a century without any very substantial change, has recently, though with great difficulty, and in spite of pertinacious opposition, been made to undergo considerable reforms. Even as it is, however, it exhibits grave faults, which are duly noted, though not wholly remedied by the Commissioners.

The most crying sin of the unreformed system was, that it demanded from the student either too much or too little. It demanded too much, if we look to its nominal requirements, involving a real proficiency in three very different branches of knowledge—classical philology, moral and mental philosophy, and Greek and Roman history. It demanded too little, if we judge it by the results which were practically found to satisfy an examiner, a certain acquaintance with the language and substance of twelve or thirteen books, most of them single works of some classical author, a facility in recollecting and using the jargon of contradictory systems of philosophy, and a moderate—sometimes a very moderate—measure of skill in Greek and Latin composition. The end proposed "as the imparting of general cultivation; the means adopted were the destruction or injury of any special aptitude which the student might possess by compelling him to bestow time and trouble on subjects which were never likely to engage his mind to any purpose, though they might very well succeed in dissipating it. This evil has been aggravated rather than mitigated by the authors of the late reforms. Two new schools are added to the old bipartite divisions of Classics and Mathematics, viz., those of Physical Science and of Modern History; but the great advantage to be expected from such an enlargement, the comprehension of students whom a narrower range of subjects had failed to attract, is neutralized by a clause requiring every candidate for a degree

to pass through two schools out of the four. And while this new grievance is added, the old one remains substantially untouched. *Besides the Greek and Latin languages*—such are the words of the statute—candidates for classical honours are to be prepared with philosophy and ancient history as before. Those who know experimentally what the Greek and Latin languages include will smile at the *πάντολμος ἀμαθία*, the confident sciolism, which thus parenthetically assumes an acquaintance with them on the part of an undergraduate as a sort of preliminary requisite. Practically, we believe, the words are likely to become mere surplusage, philosophy and ancient history alone being required. In other words, classical scholarship is to have no place whatever in the final examination. This is certainly one way of getting rid of a self-imposed difficulty. Oxford is to have a school of *literæ humaniores*, from which humane letters, so called, are to be expressly excluded—Hamlet with the character of Hamlet omitted by particular request. The Commissioners do not seem to have anticipated this solution, which has been announced since their Report appeared. They are sensible, however, that classical scholarship in Oxford requires an encouragement which no system of examinations, reformed or unreformed, has as yet supplied; and they see that the only thing to be done is to give it a department of its own. Yet even they are not free from the Oxford vice of over-loading. They talk of a school of philology, which is to embrace not only Latin and Greek, but Sanscrit and the Oriental languages, and also those of modern Europe. It is true that they would allow the student to select one or more languages as his especial study. But this, if really carried out, would create not one school but many, with different subjects and different examiners, while in practice it would probably come to the exaction of a superficial acquaintance with most or all of the languages included. The conception of an examination in *comparative philology*, which seems to lie at the bottom of this proposal, is sufficiently disposed of by Sir William Hamilton in his elaborate appendix on *Oxford as it might be*, (subjoined to his recent republication of *Discussions on Philology, &c.*), from which it may be worth while to extract a few sentences. “This doctrine,” that of ethnology, “most curious and important in itself, is, as a result to be taken upon trust, so limited, that it may be comprised in a brief book, in fact, in a single table: whereas, if intelligently known, that is, in its grounds, it imposes an acquaintance with some ten, twenty, fifty,—in truth, with above a hundred languages and dialects. Now, to institute a chair for a professor to retail his second-hand opinions is sufficiently foolish; but the lectures would be equally inept for academical education were the professor, instead of

speaking on the authority of others, himself a Mezzofanti and a Grimm in one: himself cognizant of all the relations of all the languages on which he founds: for the pupils would still be only passive recipients of another's dicta, and *their* comparative philology, at least, would at best be the philology of parrots. . . . Ethnology is thus misplaced in being made a subject of academical discipline, objectively, an important knowledge, it remains, subjectively, an unimportant mechanism."—(Pp. 690, 691, note.) The same high authority, however, emphatically recommends the cultivation of "another philology." "Nothing," he says, "can better exercise the mind than a rational study, either of the grammar of a known language, or of universal grammar, illustrated by the languages with which a student is acquainted. Here every doctrine of the teacher is elaborated by the taught. Yet this most valuable science, (an applied logic and psychology,) and most profitable exercise of mind, is wholly neglected in our Universities." We trust that this reproach will not long continue to attach to Oxford, though we doubt the existence of energy within the University sufficient to effect its removal. It might be difficult, however, to make a satisfactory division of subjects. Applied logic and psychology would seem rather to belong to a school of mental philosophy, such as the Commissioners proceed to advocate. Indeed, Sir William Hamilton himself, in a subsequent part of his Appendix, (p. 732,) when he comes to speak definitely of the subjects proper for a University course, holds very different language. He there discriminates the two kinds of knowledge which he would connect with the highest academical distinction as empirical and rational—the former a knowledge of the *fact*, comprehending "all dexterity at language, all familiarity with literary products, all acquaintance with historical record . . . limited to the domain of Greek and Roman letters," the latter a knowledge of the *cause* or *reason*, comprehending, "in a proximate sphere, the science of mind, its faculties, its laws, and its relations, (Psychology, Logic, Morals, Politics, &c.); in a less proximate sphere, the science of the instrument of mind, (Grammar, Rhetoric, Poetic, &c.)" The first he would call the department (or school) of humane letters, the second that of philosophy. "The present confusion," he says, "of the empirical and the rational, in the one department of *literæ humaniores*, originates in the inability of the tutors, as at present constituted, to teach philosophy as it was taught of old, and as by statute it should be taught still." Just as the reflection may be, we doubt whether the evil would be really remedied by the division proposed. "The nature and faculties of the human mind" may be the same now as they were in 1636, even in the case of an

Oxford undergraduate: but, in those days, the body of rational knowledge, if acquired at all, (a point about which the Commissioners are judiciously sceptical,) was acquired in seven years, not in three or four. As it is, we tremble to think of the probable results of a formal examination, not only in Psychology, Logic, Morals, and Politics, but in Grammar, Rhetoric, and Poetic. We know of but one man who would be bold enough to undertake any office in connexion with such a school, and that man is Mr. Sewell. Surely the four first-named subjects would be amply sufficient for a high department, without the addition of the three last. On the other hand, it does not seem unreasonable to expect an *intelligent* knowledge of Greek and Latin—a knowledge, that is, of principles as well as of facts—both from teachers and learners. The examination in that, in short, should include all the requisites which are usually understood to concur in forming an accomplished classical scholar. We would exclude “all acquaintance with historical record,” thinking, with the Commissioners, that history may properly claim a separate school, in which there need be no distinction of ancient and modern. Sir William Hamilton, it is true, does not wish to confine one class of students to rational, and another to empirical knowledge. On the contrary, he thinks that a minimum, not in one, but in each, ought to be established as the condition of a degree at all. We can only repeat our conviction, that a student who is expected to know many things will, as a general rule, know nothing to any purpose. Surely what is wanted is a knowledge, both rational and empirical, of some one subject. In earlier years instruction is naturally miscellaneous: the memory is the only faculty in full development, and the boy is taught a variety of things of which it is judged important that he should know something. But, as the other mental powers become matured, special education is seen to be more and more of a necessity, with reference, not merely to a professional occupation, but to the culture of the mind itself. It is precisely because, with Sir William Hamilton, we should lament to see our Universities “declining into popular seminaries for the cultivation of the superficial, the amusing, the palpable, the materially useful,” that we would have the Oxford student, in the last year of his pupillage, left perfectly free to take his own course—free to concentrate himself on classics, or mental philosophy, or history, or mathematics, so that the progress which he makes may be genuine, and the honours which are awarded to him really significant.

With regard to the further object which the Commissioners hope to attain, by a reform of academical studies, the restoration of a connexion between the Universities and the learned pro-

essions, we must confess ourselves still unconvinced. We think, as we said in our previous article, that the separation which has taken place has been owing, not only to the shortcomings of the Universities, but to the general course of society, so that we can have no great faith in any merely intra-academical remedy. To the case of Theology, indeed, this remark does not apply. If divinity students are driven to seek instruction elsewhere, at Wells, or Chichester, it is mainly because Oxford offers them none. Even the moral disadvantages, which, as Mr. Lake justly remarks, makes a University an unadvisable place for candidates for orders, are, to a certain extent, curable. Nor can we see any sufficient reason why Theology should not be made the subject of examinations and honourable distinctions. Such a stimulus would increase knowledge: it would not diminish reverence. It is not the scholar, but the dunce—not the candidate for honours, but the aspirant to an ordinary degree—who speaks and thinks disrespectfully of his books. On the other hand, it would be difficult to overrate the evils arising from the “lack of knowledge.” Whatever dangers may threaten the Church of England, none can be greater than the distrust produced by the conviction that there are questions which the clergy, as a body, are unprepared to meet. A really educated clergyman is a “restorer of belief,” quite independently of any influence which he may excite by teaching or writing. But from the schools of jurisprudence and physical science we expect no such important results. It would be hopeless, as the Commissioners see, to establish in Oxford a strictly professional education; and the number of those who can afford time for any other is likely to become less, rather than greater. At the same time, we are quite disposed to believe that a considerable portion of legal and physical knowledge might be communicated through the medium of University lectures, and that an undergraduate would do well to get a foretaste of his profession before he begins to attend chambers, or walk the hospitals. Oxford may make her teaching useful to those who still come to her, without flattering herself with hopes of recovering those whom she has unavoidably lost.

We have lingered so long among the more important details of the Oxford examinations, that we can merely allude to those which remain behind. The Commissioners recommend an examination at matriculation, but discourage one for the higher degrees. The first is absolutely required as a protection to the University against the facility of the inferior colleges, which not only sacrifice their own character, but lower the standard of the public examinations, by the admission of unqualified members. It might be well, as the Commissioners suggest, to allow deficiency in one branch to be compensated by proficiency in another, so as

not to exclude those who have not had the advantage of the ordinary course of previous instruction. But to shut the gates of the University on incurable ignorance, whether voluntary or involuntary, whether found among the rich or the poor, is no more than common sense and common justice. In discussing the question of the higher degrees, the Commissioners have scarcely shewn their wonted courage or penetration. It may be desirable, under present circumstances, to let a higher degree follow as a matter of course, where a lower one has been fairly obtained; but it cannot be well that any degree should be conferred on a candidate whose qualifications are unknown. Yet this is what they propose in the case of Divinity and Law, both the degrees in which are supposed to be supplementary to the lower degree in Arts. Surely they might have seen that here at least was an opportunity of turning the new schools to some practical account. What would be easier than to make the lower degrees in Divinity, Law, and Medicine conditional in passing an examination in the schools of Theology, Jurisprudence, and Physical Science? The present practice of postponing these degrees to later periods of University standing is a mere anachronism, belonging to the Laudian system, with its long course of years. In a modern scheme they ought clearly to be allowed to fall into their natural place, so as to become co-ordinate with the degree of B.A., as at present conferred. The student, after graduating in some one of the non-professional schools, might offer himself for examination in that faculty in which he desired, for professional reasons, to obtain a degree. This would involve no addition to the existing requirements, which oblige a candidate for the B.A. degree to go through two schools at least, at the same time that it would introduce an intelligible distinction between those who wish to prosecute their non-professional studies and those who regard their academical education merely as subsidiary to some one of the professions. The degrees of the University would be made what they should be, a reality, while the indignity, as Mr. Wall calls it, of examining senior men would be successfully avoided.

We now approach one of the most important parts of the Report—that which treats of the instruction of the University, with reference to the teachers. The historical sketch which we gave in our former Article must have enabled our readers to appreciate the difference in this respect between ancient and modern Oxford. The authorized teaching of the University was formerly conducted by the University itself: it is now in the hands of the Colleges—a change which has taken place in violation rather than in pursuance of the Statutes. To remedy this abuse, by establishing the Professorial system, not in place of,

but by the side of the Tutorial, is the task to which the Commissioners have addressed themselves.

It was hardly to be expected that the existing regime would meet with extreme severity at the hands of the Commissioners. That men, most of whom either are or were recently in actual connexion with the University, should canvass strictly the qualifications of a body, comprising the majority of the working residents, is not in human nature. Sir William Hamilton, however, is molested by no such scruples. With the unrelenting eye of a systematic philosopher, he investigates the antecedents of the Tutorial staff of each College, and the effects of their teaching, as shown in the academical successes of their pupils, combining the whole in a tabular view in which College is weighed against College with a minute accuracy extending even to fractions. The results of the comparison as regards particular Colleges, are not always such as the experience of an Oxford man would endorse—a fault owing to causes which it would be tedious to explain; but the general conclusion is clearly made out—the fact of an enormous difference between College and College, in respect of educational power. It would not be fair to rely wholly or principally on the success of the pupil as a proof of the competency of the tutor, though the two are generally supposed to bear some kind of relation to each other, and a College is to a certain extent responsible for the class of undergraduates whom its reputation attracts. But Sir William Hamilton stands on firm ground when he calls attention to the fact, that “in the two departments which the University possesses, and which the Colleges and Tutors are, *de facto*, exclusively authorized to teach, the whole Collegial Tutors (49) have only, of their body, in *Literæ Humaniores*, about a half (26), in Mathematics, about a sixth (8), of the first class;” and concludes that “if there be any connexion between superior knowledge and superior tuition, Oxford now abandons, indifferently, the work of education to competent and incompetent hands.”—(P. 701.) We need not stop to remark that the test of the public examinations, though, of course, not infallible, is generally a fair one—not to mention that the University itself elects to be tried by it; and that, as a matter of fact, the most efficient Colleges are those which number most first class men among their tutors. It is of more importance to show that the result complained of is due entirely to the Colleges themselves. The nomination of tutors belongs, apparently by an unstatutable usurpation, solely to the Head of the College, who selects them almost invariably from the Fellows, preference being mostly given to seniority. Owing to the restrictions with which all the Colleges are more or less fettered, there are very few instances in which the election to a

Fellowship is entirely open, so as to secure the services of the ablest man in the University not otherwise provided for. Thus, neither the persons in whom the choice of tutors is vested, the principle of choice, nor the field of choice, are such as to promise any large measure of educational success. If anything be wanted to complete the condemnation of the system, it is to be found in the sentence practically passed on it by the University itself in the tacit recognition of private tutors, a class of men who, as the Commissioners remark, though unknown to University or College statutes, exercise at once the personal supervision belonging to the original *Tutores*, and the privilege of free teaching which is the statutable right of all graduates. When we consider that this kind of instruction has become popular under infinite discouragement both direct and indirect, the real teaching of the best men in the University having, as is admitted by one of the most decided opponents of the system, Mr. Congreve, lain for some time past in the hands of the private tutors, though the money paid to them by the Students is not in place of but in addition to that which is exacted for College tuition, we shall learn what to think of the indefeasible right of a usurpation which has failed to justify itself not only in the eyes of the world, but even in those of its perpetrators. What plea can be urged in favour of those who are found wanting, when weighed in a balance which they have themselves been allowed to trim?

The means by which the Commissioners propose to remedy this state of things are, the reform of the Colleges and the reanimation of the Professoriate. The Tutors are to be left in *statu quo*, security being taken for their fitness by the removal of the restrictions on Fellowship elections, while those whom they have supplanted are re-established and fortified by fresh endowments drawn chiefly from the Colleges themselves. Under these circumstances, it is believed that the two systems would work well side by side, each occupying its own sphere without encroaching on that of the other. The Private Tutors are not to be directly interfered with: but hopes are expressed that their influence may be diminished, partly by the improvement of public instruction, and the greater facilities given to individual superintendence by the College Tutors, partly by the absorption of the more eminent among the Private Tutors themselves into the Professoriate, which is to have a lower department of University Lecturers, taking the more elementary part of the work, and acting as a sort of Professorial nursery.

The weak point of this arrangement appears to us to be that which affects the College Tutors. Nothing in our judgment can be said for retaining them in their present position, except the fact that they are in possession. We fully recognise the

importance of a distinction between the Professorial and Tutorial functions. Sir William Hamilton's definition shews that both have their places in a University. "By Professor," he says, "I mean a teacher exclusively privileged to deliver from his own resources and at his own discretion, a course of lectures, on a certain department of knowledge, to the whole academical alumni. By Tutor, I mean a teacher, among others, privileged to see that his peculiar pupils (a section of the academical alumni) read and understand certain books, certain texts, codes, departments of doctrine, authorized by the University." But the question which naturally arises is, why should not these Tutors be *University* Tutors? Why should not men be appointed to the Tutorial office on account of their University reputation, not in virtue of their connexion with this or that College? Even supposing the Fellowships to be given away by merit, there is surely great awkwardness in a plan which divides the qualified men in the University into twenty-four houses, and makes their appointments depend on the accidental wants of the particular society with which they may be connected. Again, why should the choice of these Tutors be left in the hands of the Heads of Houses, a body for whose discernment in educational matters the University has no guarantee? Why should the students be forced to attend the tuition supplied by the College to which they happen to attach themselves, when there may be other Tutorial lectures delivered elsewhere which would be of greater service to them? Differences between Tutor and Tutor will still exist after each College has done its best to secure the most competent men: and it is surely unjust to limit a Tutor's usefulness by the accommodation which the buildings of his College may chance to afford. Add to this, that even in a reformed Oxford the isolated character of small societies is sure to generate narrow and local feelings, petty rivalries, and a general disposition to estimate academical questions by a College rather than a University standard. The appointment of Examiners by the Proctors is at present retained on two grounds, that of justice to the Colleges, that University offices may descend to them in rotation, without reference to the comparative merit of their respective bodies of fellows, and that of justice to the undergraduates, that they may have tutors of their own to protect their interests against those of other candidates. We are not inventing motives, but merely repeating those which, if we are not greatly misinformed, have been actually assigned. Such views of justice are intelligible enough, but they are scarcely compatible with the educational action of a free University.

We think, then, that the Commissioners are mistaken in supposing that the continuance of College tuition is the best or the

only way of combining the labours of Tutors and Professors. The proper functions of a College Tutor are moral rather than intellectual. Such was undoubtedly the original conception of the office, as it appears in the College Statutes, the Ordinances of Edward VI., and even the Landian Code, though the latter superadds instruction to the Tutor's other duties. Such is, in effect, the theory current at the present hour in Cambridge, where, though the Colleges have engrossed the education no less than at Oxford, the Tutor's business is not so much to lecture to his pupils as to look after their bills. Such, finally, is the view taken by the Commissioners themselves, when they are legislating for those students who are to be admitted to the University without belonging to any College or Hall. Their lodging-houses, we read in the Report, are to be "placed under the special superintendence of University officers, to be constituted Tutors or Guardians of the University students,"—men whose "duty would be, so far as the case permitted, to acquaint themselves with the character and circumstances of these students, and to take all means in their power for exercising over them a due moral and religious superintendence." Yet it surely cannot be meant that these students are to go without tutorial instruction. What is necessary for residents in Colleges must be equally necessary for residents in unattached lodgings. The obvious solution is, the appointment of Tutors by the University. Their classes would be formed to suit the wants not of the undergraduates of each College, but of the aggregate mass. This would at once remove what is felt to be an inherent evil in the present system,—“that of crowding into the same class students differing greatly in knowledge and capacity, merely because they happen to come to the University at the same time.” Oxford would, in fact, realize the condition of a large public school, the chief difference being that the classes would consist not of boys, but of young men, and consequently that the scale of instruction as a whole would be higher, while the discipline enforced would be less irksome. The Professorial lectures would find their natural parallel in the instruction given to the Sixth Form at Eton or Rugby. The mechanical arrangement of the classes might be the same as that which now obtains in College lectures, men being drafted from one class to another without that inflexible regularity of promotion which is required where rewards and punishments have to be looked to as the principal motive powers. Sir William Hamilton, who goes into the subject very fully, (pp. 718-724,) proposes that honours should be awarded by the joint suffrage of pupils and teachers,—a suggestion probably better adapted to the latitude of Edinburgh or Glasgow than to that of Oxford. But we must not wander into details.

One complaint, at least, we may safely make of the Commissioners. If they found themselves unable or unwilling to reduce the College tutors to their normal dimensions, why could they not have followed the milder counsels of Mr. Clough, who sees "no reason why" the proficients of the several Colleges "should not be united in a College class, and the viva disjoined from the *mortua corpora*, by collegiate or inter-collegiate arrangements?" The concordat need hardly bear even on the less competent Tutors, who would merely be required to abandon what ought to be the distasteful work of lecturing on certain subjects with which they are not fully conversant. In any case, their anticipated remonstrances cannot be set against the palpable interest of the students. The practice of a public school, which we have just referred to, will furnish us with an apt illustration. What would be said if the assistant-masters, instead of taking some a higher, some a lower form, were to claim to teach those boys, and those boys only, who happened to reside in their respective boarding-houses, as a matter of justice to themselves, and as the only means of maintaining an influence over their pupils?

The reanimation of the professoriate is a measure for which it could hardly have been supposed that an apology would be needed. Anywhere but in Oxford Professor Vaughan's splendid vindication of his order, (Evidence, p. 274,) which we wish our space would allow us to extract, would read like the eulogy pronounced on Hercules by the sophist in the story. But the collegiate system is not only alien from, but antagonistic to the professoriate; and even the reform camp is recruited from the anti-professorial party. In extracting passages from the evidence of the most prominent of these recusants, Mr. Pattison, the Commissioners significantly express their belief that there are many persons entertaining sentiments of a similar kind. Mr. Pattison's own opinion, however, deserves attention in itself, from the ability with which he has unfolded and illustrated it, as well as from the character which is stamped on the portion of his evidence already quoted by us, that of a vigorous and decided reformer. In the course of delivering it, he reviews the intellectual history of the Universities in a rapid but effective sketch, which is well worth consulting for its own sake, independently of any arguments which may or may not be deducible from it. One thing is evident, that in denouncing professorial instruction, "the system of delivering courses of original dissertations to a miscellaneous audience," as superficial and unsatisfactory, he is not decrying a line in which he might not himself excel. Nevertheless, we cannot think that he has made out any case for his alarm. As the Commissioners well remark, his argument involves several assumptions;—the incompatibility of the profes-

social and tutorial systems—the absolute sufficiency of the former, and the inevitable superficiality of the latter. For the first of these, indeed, the Commissioners themselves are in some measure answerable. A reference to Mr. Pattison's evidence will show that his fears are excited by the proposed admission of unattached students, which he regards as a virtual substitution of professorial for tutorial instruction. The Report shews that the apprehension is not groundless, as by refusing to separate the tutorial from the collegiate system, the Commissioners apparently wish to leave these students without any tuition at all. But to protest against the abrogation of the tutoriate is one thing, and to assert its exclusive efficiency another. Yet Mr. Pattison throughout appears to think that he may do either indifferently. Because pupils require to be made to master standard books, he argues that they will not be the better for hearing original dissertations. Because theories are mere tumid verbiage to minds unfurnished with facts, he argues that the knowledge of facts is sufficient without them. Because in French and American education, as he supposes, showy and current accomplishment is the end desired, and exclusively professorial instruction the means adopted, he argues that the same result would follow in a country where both end and means are different. In one case, at least, we must take leave to question not only his inferences but his observation. Surely no one who had not an argument to maintain would speak of German instruction as *superficial*. “The absence of all taste in composition, and the fatal defects of expression,” which Mr. Pattison laments in the great men of Germany, are precisely the faults which, as he admits himself, a superficial culture has excluded in the case of France. If their attainments are but the attainments of a few, what is to be said of the attainments of the graduates of Oxford? Will Mr. Pattison tell us that the majority of Oxford students are more thoroughly educated than the youths described in his quotation from Dr. Niemeyer? The distinction between the intellectual and educational value of a lecturer's original researches may be speculatively correct, but cannot go for much practically. Why should not a well-grounded and inquiring hearer—and we are speaking only of such—feel something of that “vivifying effect” which, according to Mr. Pattison's own admission, “we ourselves experience from new views?” The allegation, that a professor is likely to be less useful than a book on the one hand, and than a tutor on the other, is another logical juggle. At worst he might surely be serviceable as combining a *portion* of the educational advantages of each. But we believe that beside this he might be something different from and, so far, superior to either. What that would be is expressed in the well-known

words of Niebuhr, quoted by the Commissioners, (p. 96.) Of the "thousand thoughts" which are "awakened" by "the sight" of an assemblage of hearers, and the sense of "the personal relation in which they stand towards" their professor, how few present themselves either to the writer or reader of a book, either to the catechiser or to the catechised student! At the close of his remarks Mr. Pattison virtually abandons his heresy by censuring the professorial system as the *main* method of education; but the surrender comes too late. Whether from dread of the supposed anti-tutorial tendencies of the Commissioners, or from involuntary one-sidedness, he has certainly contrived to produce the impression that he is altogether opposed to professorial instruction. We are sorry for the result, as it takes away from the effect of at least one remark which, as we shall see presently, is really valuable. But we would not punish him further than by wishing that he may himself become a member of an active professoriate in a regenerate Oxford.

A more tangible objection to the restoration of the professoriate might be, that it is the revival of a system which has already died a natural death. But we demur to the fact. The death of the professoriate was not natural, having been caused partly by want of proper sustenance, partly by actual violence. The Laudian Examinations had no connexion with professorial lectures; the later examinations were not established till professorial teaching had ceased to exist. The professorship of Moral Philosophy we know to have been deliberately stifled for more than a hundred and fifty years by a private compact among the electors. Now that it has recovered its existence, it has shewn that it is abundantly endowed with inherent vitality. Four other of the statutable readerships were illegally extinguished by the Hebdomadal Board, at what time and under what circumstances we know not; and the re-establishment of one of these has been attended with sufficient success to shew that the day for a University prælector of Logic is by no means past. As for the Chairs of the other sciences, which, as forming part of the Oxford course, might afford a test of the efficiency or inefficiency of the professoriate, we do not know how they first became ineffective, but we know why they still continue so. The Professor of Ancient History delivers no available lectures; the Professor of Greek none whatever. The Professor of Latin does not exist even in name. On the other hand, Dr. Arnold's and Professor Vaughan's lectures on Modern History drew crowded audiences before the University held out any inducement to the study of that subject. There is no need to fear that the ears of the undergraduates are closed. "*Dein Herz ist zu, dein Sinn ist todt.*"

The details of the restoration may be difficult in practice, but they are comparatively easy to arrange in theory. It will be necessary to found new professorships, and to increase the endowments of existing Chairs. Every subject which the University undertakes to teach ought to have one or more professors, as the case may be. At present the only department which can be said to be adequately endowed is that of Theology, which has seized on several of the canonries of Christ Church. The lay professors will require to have their numbers and their incomes raised in proportion. The Report justly says, that £800 a year is the least which they have a right to expect. Whence the funds are to be drawn we shall see before long. To all these recommendations, which the Commissioners pursue into minute particulars, we give our hearty assent. If they are not carried out it will only be because the strength of possession is stronger than the strength of reason. We agree, too, that professorships should be freed from all restrictions whatever, except the *negative* theological test provided by the statute, which forbids all professors to impugn the faith of the Church of England. On the mode of appointing professors the Commissioners would have done well to consult an elaborate article by Sir William Hamilton in the *Edinburgh Review* for April 1834, containing a large historical induction in favour of the establishment of a body of curators for this special object. Meantime there is much to be said for the two kinds of patronage which the Report most favours—that by the Crown, and that by the Reformed Congregation. The latter may at any rate safely be preferred to such existing nuisances as election by Convocation, by graduates in Divinity, by the Hebdomadal Board. At present the standing evils of elections within the University are two—collegiate interest and theological party. The former will be impaired by any measure tending to establish an extra-collegiate power, such as the new House of Congregation, *once fairly constituted*, might be expected to be. The latter will probably never disappear till Oxford ceases to be a Church University; and even then it is quite possible that secular Chairs may be made objects of struggle between rival denominations. For ourselves, we hope as much from the mere multiplication of professorships as from any more direct guarantee of purity of election. Where there are many prizes the fever of intrigue will necessarily cool, and honest men will be more likely to get their due.

The project of University lecturers certainly looks well at first sight. If introduced into Oxford as it now is, or under the circumstances contemplated by the Commissioners, it would undoubtedly do great good, principally by affording congenial

employment to unplaced talent and learning. But it may be doubted how far the duties of these lecturers would be distinguished from those of the tutors, except by the factitious concomitants of exemption from College restraints, and a sort of hereditary expectancy of a professorship. The professor, as we have seen, delivers original expositions; the tutor sees that his pupils know their books: but what is the lecturer to do? In a thoroughly reformed system, where tutorial as well as professorial labours were regulated and economized by the University, the difficulty would doubtless be felt and provided for.

Before leaving the Report on the professoriate, we must note, briefly but gravely, one great omission. No place whatever is made for those scholars and men of science whose vocation it may be to teach by the pen rather than by the tongue. Professor Vaughan has done justice to the utility of "silent men" in a strain of commanding eloquence, which the Commissioners actually quote, as if unconscious of its meaning. Another of those who have given evidence has made this particular deficiency the key-note of all his suggestions. Even Mr. Pattison, in his academical scheme, has found room for a professor who is "not the organ of instruction," but "the man of greatest attainment in his branch, rewarded and withdrawn from instruction, to enable him to devote himself to the cultivation of the more abstruse parts of his science." But the Commissioners apparently ignore altogether either the existence or the desirability of such an element. In this at least they are sure to have the vulgar on their side.

We pass, *cicco pede*, over a few pages of detail about scholarships, prizes, libraries, and museums, as adapted rather for special than for general consideration. The question of the University revenues is equally technical, and embarrassed with the further difficulty of the absence of authentic information, owing to the refusal of the authorities to comply with requests made in the name of their royal Visitor. All that we can do is to endorse the five recommendations of the Commissioners,—the publication of the University accounts, the publication of all fees and their application, and the reduction of their amount, the confinement of academical revenues to academical objects, (a most important point, as unenlightened majorities are at present in the habit of voting away the trust-money of the corporation for objects which, though ostensibly public, are really, as regards the University, of a private nature, such as the support of colonial Episcopacy,) the repeal of the stamp duty on matriculations and degrees, and the granting of a license of mortmain to enable the University to invest its funded property in land. The remainder of our space must be devoted to the last, and in

some respects the most serious question mooted in the Report—the reform of the Colleges.

We have already said that we are not going to tell twice the tale of the foundation of these institutions, nor to slay the slain arguments in support of their inviolability. In a national document like the Report, it is right that the historical truth should be formally stated, and the current fallacies judicially disallowed; but a reviewer, having once gone over the ground, may be excused from traversing it again. A different reason prevents us from discussing another part of this division of the subject—the special recommendations with regard to particular Colleges. Whatever means we may have for judging of their appropriateness, we can hardly presume that those whom we address will have been similarly favoured; and when we think of the errors into which Sir William Hamilton has fallen in his estimate of the “educational eminence” of Merton and Corpus, we may well shrink from the task of descanting on academical mysteries to a purely lay reader. Our remarks shall therefore be confined to the general reforms suggested as necessary for the whole collegiate body. The abolition of all local and family restrictions on fellowships is, of course, the first thing. The restrictions to particular schools are removed in the case of fellowships, continued in that of scholarships. New College, however, is made an exception, being allowed to retain its connexion with Winchester, though the old ties are to be roadjusted. We cannot understand the ground of this exemption. The only shadow of a reason which appears in the evidence is contained in the words “Notwithstanding, few persons would be willing to give up the associations of William of Wykeham,” following immediately on a statement of the practical evils of the connexion. How can the associations of William of Wykeham, in any true or high sense, be said to be preserved by the spectacle of a College paralyzed by an indissoluble alliance with a single school, not of the first rank? However, the next recommendation of the Commissioners makes some amends for this momentary feebleness. The obligation of fellows to orders is entirely swept away, and an inestimable benefit conferred not only on education, literature, and the other professions, but on the clergy. It might have been expected that the obligation to celibacy would have followed; but the fear of ridicule has prevailed, and the restriction is retained on grounds which apply only to tutors, and even as regards them are by no means impregnable. The obligation to residence is to be annulled statutely, as it has long been annulled practically. The property disqualification, as it may be called, is to be put on a uniform and more intelligible footing, income as well as property being included, and the disqualifying

amount raised. All compulsion to proceed to higher degrees is to be removed—an arrangement which would not have been required if those degrees had been rationally dealt with. Something is to be done towards purifying College Elections, by substituting in the larger societies electoral boards in the place of universal suffrage, by abolishing all nominations by persons or bodies external to the College, and by extending the right of appeal to the visitor from decisions presumably unstatutable to decisions presumably not according to merit. Certain fellowships are to be specifically appropriate to proficients in the new university studies. Colleges are to be compelled to found open scholarships adequate in number and value. The wealthier societies, such as All Souls, New College, Queen's, Magdalen, Merton, and Corpus, are to receive from one to six professors, for whose benefit a certain proportion of the fellowships are to be suppressed. University lecturers are to be ordinary fellows of Colleges, living partly on their fellowships, partly on fees from their pupils, and allowed to marry. The Election to Headships of Colleges is still to be vested in the fellows, who, however, are to be permitted to choose any Master of Arts. Lastly, visitors are to require annual reports from their respective Colleges, and transmit such reports to the Queen in Council.

All this, bold as it is in some respects, and likely to be beneficial so far as it goes, appears to us essentially unsatisfactory. It is, in fact, mere tinkering—an attempt to improve a thing which is not partially but wholly unsuitable. College life at one time meant something very definite, comprehensible, and real. College life now means nothing of the kind. A fellow used to be a poor student, following an ecclesiastical rule, performing certain duties, religious and domestic, and receiving a small payment. A fellow is now a clergyman, a lawyer, a physician, a London habitué, differing in no respect from other clergymen, lawyers, physicians, and habitués, except that he is presumably a man of superior education, possesses £200 a-year of his own, and is unmarried. Even resident fellows are precisely like other resident graduates, the only distinguishing features, in addition to those already named, being that they sometimes attend daily service, dine together whenever they have no better engagement, meet occasionally for the nominal performance of business, which is really performed by officials, and live in rooms instead of in lodgings. Again, the collegiate framework is not necessary to the existence of tutors: their present lectures might be delivered in University lecture-rooms, their present superintendence exercised over halls or boarding-houses. All powerful as the Colleges are in the Uni-

versity, the University cannot be said to gain anything by their organization. The good that is done in Oxford could be done without such a machinery. After this we need not add, that the machinery itself is something worse than harmless. Perhaps there is no evil greater than the atmosphere of unreality which it tends to produce. As we observed just now in the case of New College and Winchester, men imagine that they are carrying out the work of a mediæval founder, when they are pursuing occupations which even, when most useful and laudable, are totally different from anything contemplated by him. Hence arises a waste of effort, a yearning after hopeless ideals, the more to be regretted in proportion to the greater elevation and purity of the natures so employed. The real wants, intellectual and moral, of the age and nation are ignored and despised in the vain attempt, however disguised from the mind itself, to recall an irrevocable past. Leisure and quiet, and means of study, which might be engaged in satisfying the inquiries of a busy but speculative century, are used only to thwart them. The theological history of the last twenty years is no more than a logical deduction from the operation of the collegiate system. It was no mere accident that connected the Tracts for the Times with the Oriel Common Room, and the persecution of Dr. Hampden with the Corpus Committee. And while the higher minds are exhausted by this unreality, the lower are filled by realities of a very earthly sort. Community of life, to which special duties are not attached, naturally comes to be synonymous with community of indulgence. Jobbing is proverbially the vice of corporations; and small corporations, without any definite object, are peculiarly liable to it. The injunction which is at present found in the statutes of some Colleges, to prefer a member of the society in an academical election to any other candidate, is a duty which naturally commends itself to a Fellow's moral sense. Not many years ago four close Colleges, distinguished for nothing but the number of their fellows, formed a league which went by the appropriate name of the Unholy Alliance, for the express object of carrying elections. This conspiracy against the University was at last broken up by a disagreement among the conspirators about the division of the spoil, but not until it had procured the exclusion of several men enjoying a university reputation in favour of persons undistinguished before or since. The opening of the foundations may possibly prevent the repetition of such a scandal as this; but it will not remove the unmeaningness or inexpediency of the system. Even when a fellowship is open, it is nothing better than a scanty celibate sinecure. Even after the new professors have taken their share, a number of these sinecures will still remain

—and it is scarcely possible that many of them should not be ill bestowed. If a College had no more appointments than were absolutely required for the work it had to do, there might be some security for the choice of fit men: but the permission of non-residence shews that this is not expected under the new regime. It may be right that a certain portion of the resources of Oxford should be employed to help men who have distinguished themselves there on entering upon a profession: but why not let this be done fairly and openly by means expressly calculated for the end? In a word, why suffer any part of the academical revenue to be apportioned without a special object, recognised and provided for as such? Why make the distribution of the intellectual and educational forces of the University depend in any way on the accidental existence of twenty-four houses? If tutorships are desirable, why not let them exist for their own sake? If professors require maintenance, why billet them on societies with which they have nothing to do, and to which they might possibly be uncongenial? These are questions which, it is obvious, strike at the root of the Collegiate system, not only as it is, but as it will be, if the suggestions of the Report should take effect. Whether they have ever occurred to the Commissioners themselves is more than we can pretend to guess. But we can well understand why they should have been kept out of sight on the present occasion. In any case, however, there is no reason why a reviewer should not ask them.

Nevertheless, after all our objections, we must return to our original verdict. If the Report is open to some criticisms, we feel that they may be made without detracting from its substantial excellence. And though we might ourselves wish to re-write a few of its pages, we more than doubt whether we should allow that privilege to any one else. "Pass it, pass it!" was the exclamation with which the most enlightened and most independent of Liberal journals greeted the promulgation of the Reform Bill in 1831. So our desire is that the recommendations of the Commissioners may become law as quickly as possible, without change or modification. In Parliament, most of those acquainted with the condition of the Universities are hostile to reform; and if the Liberals descend to the discussion of particular points, in the hope of introducing improvements, they may be deceived into letting go the very things which Reformers within the Universities feel to be most precious. Let them beware of Mr. Gladstone in committee.

- ART. II.—1. *Acta Laboratorii Chymici Monacensis seu Physica Subterranea*. (Leipz. 1703. STAHL's edition of BECCHER's principal work.)
2. *G. E. Stahl's Fundamenta Chymiae Dogmatico-Rationalis et Experimentalis, &c.* Norimbergae, 1747.
3. *Experiments upon Magnesia Alba, Quicklime, &c.* By JOSEPH BLACK, M.D. Edinburgh, 1782.
4. *Traité Élémentaire De Chimie, &c.* Par M. LAVOISIER, de l'Académie des Sciences, &c. Paris, 1789.
5. *Leçons sur la Philosophie Chimique, &c.* Par M. DUMAS, recueillies par M. BÉNAU. Paris, 1837.

THE polypharmacists of the Arabian school of medicine, and the alchemists of mediæval Europe, followed ideas so transcendental that, in so far as their ever-vanishing aims were concerned, they at first sight seem to stand in no true historical relation with the moderate and practical chemists of the present century. The seeking for the alcahest or universal solvent, the attempt to extract the elixir of life, the effort to lay hands on the philosophical stone, (and that among the mist and darkness of a time which was rather the night than the morning of science), were things essentially unlike the sober and attainable aims of our own positive chemistry; and the men of our laboratories could have taken little interest in the labours they involved, had it not been for the fact that those old scholastics, chasing images they were never to seize, worked out thousands of incidental results. If they went after the illusions of the dawn, shaped out of the murk by the twisted rays of a sun which was yet far below their horizon, it was on the solid ground of nature that they sped their weary hunt; and many a trophy they found lying in the twilight, ready for their early hands, sometimes dazzling them into false perception again, but always rewarding their pains. If they were fond idealists, if they were visionaries, they were also chemists; and it is as chemists that they deserve the recognition of the world. They worked with water, they worked with fire; they digested, boiled, distilled, roasted, burned, smelted, crystallized, set agoing putrefactions and fermentations; in short, they put in operation the same sorts of processes upon the same sorts of stuff as ourselves. Following their hereditary and antique elemental ideas, they were the first discoverers of those material principles and compounds, which are commonly called chemicals. Trying to scale the heavens, they began to subdue the earth. It has been remarked, indeed, that those of the polypharmacists, regarding whom there is any information extant, seem to have been vastly more taken up with their pharmacological preparations than with their panaceal speculation; while

the really great men among the alchemists, from Roger Bacon down even to Paracelsus, were the busy students of such chemical reactions as could then be brought within the reach of the experimentalist, and made no personal pretensions to the stone.* The hypothetical idea of both these successive schools, namely, the transmutation or elevation of the metals and the analogous elevation of man's fallen and sickly body into the state of golden health, seems at all times to have been a very separable thing from the everyday occupations and practical hopes of the higher order of adepts; although it certainly vitiated their observations not a little, and corrupted the phraseology of their works through and through, if it did not demoralize their intellectual habits in some degree. Soon after the insolent, but gallant and imperative protest of Aureolus Theophrastus Bombastus Paracelsus, modestly so self-styled, against the pseudo-aristoteleanism of the medical school of his day, the alchemical theory and the alchemical practice of genuine observation in the laboratory fell asunder;—one might say, always under censure for a play upon words, that the Arabian particle separated itself by fission from the good Greek noun, if Greek it be; the oriental Al took itself off, and left chemistry to pursue its own fortunes. The ancient eastern element, however, did not at once disappear from the earth; for it retained its devotees, no longer respectable because behind their age, till the close of last century; and indeed it has them yet, old half-witted men and younger monomaniacs not a few; happy creatures, ignoring all the results of growing science, and catching at the gifts of nature with ineffectual hands, like ghosts at a feast! On the other hand, those of the sons of the prophets, who at this parting of the ways chose the path of true chemistry, were men of much diligence and sound understandings, and they addicted themselves with zeal to the finding out of all sorts of new chemicals and chemical reactions. Van Helmont had begun life as an alchemist, not in the sinister sense of the word; but he ended his career as a chemist of some degree of worthiness, although he will perhaps be better known to posterity as the originator of that hypothesis concerning an all-pervading cosmical fluid, which has been elaborated in later times by Mesmer and Reichenbach. Libavius, who came upon the fuming chloride of tin, Cassius, whose purple precipitate of gold is as beautiful and curious as ever, Glauber, whose 'wonderful salt' is still the friend of horses and horse-doctors, and the sensible though prosy Agricola, deserve remembrance for their industry and the number of single facts they found out; and it must never be forgotten that it was little better than an unmitigated

* Alchemy and the Alchemists. Chambers' Papers for the People, No. 66.

chaos of things and thoughts, in the thick of which they had to do their poor day's-work. It should also be observed in their praise that, if they were a kind of learned artizans rather than men of science, it was particularly in their persons that (what Comte not happily calls) the metaphysical epoch of scientific history was reaching towards a higher stage of development, namely, toward the positive epochal method, the era of Descartes and Bacon, the day of experimental observation and the inductive syllogism.

It will be readily understood how, as soon as the mind of science was withdrawn from aims which were too lofty for its reach, and was then unreservedly directed to the positive labours of the laboratory, there would quickly succeed a remarkable extension of practical or concrete chemistry. The only thing that could compensate the emancipated votaries of alchemy for the giving up of their great ideal, and thereby appease the craving of the soul for greatness of some sort or another, was the rapid accumulation of a great mass of new information. Ideal had to be substituted by material wonderfulness, sublimity by size, depth by surface: and it must be confessed even by the lingering disciples of the alchemical mysticism, if such postumous and undated spirits can turn aside for a moment from their enchanted toils, that the number of solid and liquid bodies, curious for their aspect or for their properties as chemical reagents, acids, alkalis, salts, mixts, calxes, precipitates, sublimates, essences, oils, butters and spirits, which were brought out of nature at this period, was astonishing. It is impossible, indeed, for the most positive and the least speculative of the chemists of the present day, were it even a Rose among his platinum crucibles or a Plattner with his blowpipe, to overvalue the amount of plain, honest and sufficient, though merely preliminary, work that was done between the apotheosis of alchemy and the ascension of the phlogistic chemistry.

But that happy, though somewhat meteoric, rise of a new science from the shaken ashes of the old mystery was not long of beginning; for, in the midst of all the gathering and crowding details, wrought out by the post-alchemical craftsmen, a true chemical principle began to gleam. These industrious experimentalists began to understand, once for all, that the act of the burning of a body, or the process of combustion, as it is now called, is a phenomenon of principal significance in chemistry. Perceiving that the interpretation of the burning of a piece of wood, or brimstone, or anything else that is capable of being destroyed or changed by fire, would yield the clew to this whole department of inquiry, namely, to the half-chaotic mass of the chemical discoveries of the period, they invented a theory, or rather a hypothesis of the fictitious,

sort, capable of rendering the phenomenon of fire intelligible to the mind, but not of explaining it in conformity with the now known reality of things; and it was that memorable hypothesis which constituted or consummated the new movement, and fairly consolidated the second epoch of chemical development. But their doctrine was founded on fact, and it owed all its value to the facts it represented. Notwithstanding the fictitiousness of the point of view, on which they eventually planted themselves, they were eminently practical men. They noticed with learned eye that the process of common combustion concealed one of those central facts, on the elimination of which the progress of science is ever and anon depending. Obedient to the hint of genius, they proceeded to the generalization of the phenomenon throughout all its known particulars and circumstances. The metals, with the exception of silver and gold, were changed into rusts or calxes, resembling chalk or brick-dust or other coloured earthy bodies, when heated high in exposure to the air of the furnace; and this alteration they saw to be identical with what is undergone by brimstone, phosphorus or any common combustible, when it burns with flame. Tin burns with a glow, indeed, which is so like ordinary flame as to have been quite adequate to the suggesting of the rest of the secret;—no secret now-a-days, of course, since we work in metals that take fire when thrown on water, and think nothing of burning iron-wire in oxygen like a wax-match in the air; but a great affair for the early twilight, between the meteors of the alchemical night and the coming sun of positive chemistry, in which it was first made. It was thus, then, that the whole science, such as it was in the first watch of the post-mediæval morning of its now broad day, was divided into distinguishable parts:—the study of bodies before combustion, and that of the same bodies after that great cosmical process. This division of chemical objects implied, as a matter of course, the study of the act of combustion itself. Unburned matter was the thesis, burned matter the antithesis, and the process of burning the mesothesis, of the new logic of chemistry. The matters were as various as nature could afford; they already knew a large number of substances, and undoubtedly anticipated the acquisition of many more: but the process was one and indivisible.

Even this dividing of all the species of matter then known into these two great classes, the burned and the unburned, was most important for the wants of the period; and it is now well understood to have been founded in truth. In a larger sense, it is as true to-day as it was then, that all mineral substances are either combustibles or ashes; and in the smaller sense of those grandfathers of ours, namely, in that of every inorganic matter being either a combustible or an atmospheric ash (that is, an oxide) it

is still correct, in so far as the immense majority of natural bodies are concerned. The chemistry of that time was therefore brought into intelligible order by the generalization in question; and all the facts, of which its body then consisted, were thereby made to revolve round one great phenomenon as their common centre. In short, similar things were put together, in spite of their apparent dissimilarity; and dissimilar things were put asunder, notwithstanding their superficial resemblances; and a genuine reformation was begun, all with a degree of sagacity far more than equal to the task in hand. But it has already been hinted that those venerable chemists were by no means satisfied with the perception and exposition of the analogy that subsists between the metallic calxes and the acids, nor yet with their new classification of material forms. They advanced, without the infirmity of a doubt, to the explication of the phenomenon of fire itself, that one and universal agent of their chemical transformations. Nor was an interpretation, say rather a figment or a hypothesis, far to seek. The fiction, that fire is a substantial, though subtile, material element of nature, had been promulgated by Empedocles more than four centuries before the coming of Christ: handed down to the polypharmacists, it had played but a small figure in their doctrine: brought to Europe once more, the alchemists had written not a little about it and about it, while they had made nothing of it whatever as a theoretic centre: but now it was destined to quicken the whole mass of a growing chemistry, and to give that unity to all its parts, of which they stood more in need than ever. In fine, the ancient Greek, if not Egyptian, matter of fire, the empyrean element of the old quaternion, was at length recognised, set apart and consecrated by the hierophants of a young European science under the classical name and style of Phlogiston!

Not to trace the hypothesis embodied in that long-lived word with historical accuracy from chemist to chemist, or even from time to time of its existence as a scientific power, let us look at it as an epochal whole before proceeding to the consideration of the positive chemistry of Lavoisier and his more manly school.

A lighted candle burns till it is done, giving out flame or matter of fire all the while:—for what reason, but because a candle is a compound of candle-matter and phlogiston, because that compound is decomposed when it burns, and because phlogiston is thereby set free and shews itself in the flame from the beginning to the end of the process? The pure dephlogisticated candle-matter is also liberated, of course, little by little as the taper burns from top to socket; that candle-matter turning out to be carbonic acid gas and water, as discovered by later methods of research: so that, according to the phlogistic chemistry, tallow should have

been tabulated as a compound of fire with water and fixed air. Counting the ashes of the wick and oil, this was neither more nor less than the experiment of the Greek physiologists after all : —phlogiston or fire, carbonic acid or air, moisture or water, and ashes or earth ! But our cunning and well-appointed chemists, as has been said above, generalized the idea all over the enlarging science. A stick of brimstone burns away with a blue flame and a suffocating vapour, and the residue of its combustion is the sulphurous acid : in the language of the phlogistians, brimstone is a compound of two things, sulphurous acid and phlogiston ; and, when it is suffered to burn, it gives out its phlogiston or flame of fire, and there remains its dephlogisticated sulphur, or sulphurous acid, in the separated state. Phosphorus contains, according to the exploded hypothesis, a white deliquescent acid and phlogiston ; and that so loosely united as to be kindled or decomposed by a little friction, or by a slight elevation of its temperature : being burned, it sheds its phlogiston and the phosphoric acid is reproduced. This school also regarded the metals as compound bodies : each metal was supposed to consist of its own rust or calx and the all-embracing phlogiston ; and, when any metal was burnt to a calx in the fire or before the blowpipe, it was considered to have given out its fiery principle, and its ashes or rust remained. Iron was composed of iron-rust and fire, in the scientific theory of those speculators ; dephlogistinate it, that is, burn it to a cinder, and you have the rust. Hence some bodies, such as wood, coal and especially charcoal, which give out much heat and leave apparently little dephlogisticated matter when burnt, were viewed as substances overcharged with phlogiston, and therefore capable of imparting it largely to others. Now it always was, as it still is, desirable to transform ores, such as the iron-rust in the various iron-stones, into reguline metals, such as iron ; and it has long been understood that the best way of doing so, in the majority of common instances, consists in mingling those ores with carbon in some form or other and then heating them in the furnace ; a thing but too easily explained by the fiction under consideration, for the carbon had only to pour its phlogiston into the ores, and thereby to convert them to metallic natures, solid and bright ! In the substance of silver and gold, however, the fire was so compacted and inherent that nothing could take it out of them ; and thence their fixity in the furnace, under all ordinary circumstances : other metals were dephlogisticated or turned to mere calxes, their metallic nature quite gone when heated to redness or melted in the air ; but the royal pair remained intact under the fiercest trial, and that constituted their royalty then, as it is one of the conditions of their value now. Even when their calxes were stealthily made by

precipitation from the solutions of these noble metals, in the nitric and the nitro-muriatic acids respectively (the strong and the royal waters of a bye-gone terminology), the least elevation of temperature, even the action of light in some circumstances, or the mere contact of some highly phlogisticated substance, at once enabled them to snatch back their appropriate portions of phlogiston, and thereupon to become silver and gold again!

It might readily have occurred to an ingenuous student of those days to inquire into the fortunes of phlogiston, when once liberated from a metal or a combustible: for, after the combustion of a piece of phosphorus, for example, the phosphoric acid remained and could be bottled up as a specimen of one of the supposed ingredients of that kind of matter; but what came of the fiery principle? where did the flame go to? was it merely seen for a moment and then lost? could it not be caught and kept like the acid? The opinion of the ancients seems to have been that it ascended right to the empyrean, that boundless space of pure fire which was supposed to inclose the air as the air inclosed the earth and the water of their universe; but, in the view of the phlogistians, it was no sooner liberated from a combustible than it passed into combination with the surrounding atmosphere, coming forth from the latent state of combination only to be devoured by the air, born only to die again! It could not, indeed, be emancipated from its union with one body unless another were ready to take it in without delay: fire was the momentaneous glance of phlogiston in its passage from one engagement to another; and thence the necessity of air to common fire, or else of some other atmosphere to the process of combustion in its more exceptional forms. It was, therefore, in connexion with this way of thinking concerning flame (and respiration at a later period) that Priestley, when he discovered oxygen, one of the constituents of our mingled atmosphere, supposed it to be air deprived of that phlogiston which fire-places and lungs appeared to be continually pouring into it, and he called it dephlogisticated air.

Among the difficulties which stood in the way of poor phlogiston, there was one which it needed both ingenuity and hardihood to surmount. It had been early observed (especially by Jean Rey, whose name deserves honourable mention as the unwitting herald of Lavoisier) that certain metals were heavier after than before calcification: ten grains or ounces of lead weighed more than ten after having been burned to a calx; whereas they ought to have weighed less, if phlogiston were really a material substance. Lead, supposed a compound body, gave off one of its ingredients, phlogiston, becoming thereby the mere calx of lead; and yet that calx was heavier than the

original lead. Whereupon the friends of phlogiston discovered that it was the one exceptional substance, and possessed of the unique property of positive levity; so that what body soever it entered into union with, such as lead-calx, straightway became lighter than it was before such addition to its substance! Air and smoke had formerly been supposed to be positively light, until Torricelli shewed that they rise, not because of their greater levity, but on account of their less density; and it is curious to consider that the popular mind, as well as the young or half-taught individual intellect, resembles the earlier historic spirit in this particular, and is invariably prone to the conception of cold, darkness, and other undeniable privatives or minors, as positive things. It is easy to smile at such mistakes now-a-days, with all those accumulated advantages to which the present age has been promoted by the labours of the very men who made them; but it is difficult to realize the position and the attitude of their minds. To do the former requires only a little information and slippancy; while the latter demands knowledge, reverence and imagination. It would be as ridiculous as it is impossible, of course, for the investigators of the nineteenth century to go back to the ways of thinking (not to mention the opinions and attainments) in science of the mediæval or the transitional period: but it were desirable to study the circumstances and the psychological direction of the times, together with the particular misconceptions and hypotheses which prevailed in them; for it is probable, if not certain, that similar errors, both in method and in matter, predominate in those departments of our own science, which have not yet lifted themselves entirely out of the limbo of fiction.

This singular evasion of the question of weight, frank and ready as it was, only introduced another perplexity; but the good old chemists were equal to the new emergency. If the calx of lead, or of any other metal, became lighter in common balance-weight by combining with phlogiston, that subject of a positive levity, how was it that it also became specifically heavier? The calx was a comparatively light sort of stone; the lead, into which it was converted by union with light phlogiston, was a comparatively heavy metal: a cubic inch of the metal was twice as heavy as an inch of the stone. If the particles of an ounce of calx had buoys of fire attached to them, so as at once to change them into particles of lead and to make them lighter in the aggregate, how should such enlarged and lightened particles produce a metal of so much greater a specific gravity than the unphlogisticated rust! But there lay the secret: these phlogisticated particles of calx were not enlarged, they were only lightened; the fiery particles were not stuck on the calx

ones like so many vesicles; they penetrated them, as a sword goes into a scabbard, and then constricted or compressed them, as the earth draws the atmosphere tight about it, so that a greater number of the fire-pierced calcareous particles, thereby rendered metallic, packed into the same space, and therefore the metal was specifically heavier, though absolutely lighter, than the calx from which it was made!

How catholic, elastic and satisfactory this venerable hypothesis must have been! It was all wrong, indeed, as a substantive doctrine. In one particular, it was a sort of reverse of the truth. It is not the calxes and acids that are simple: it is not the combustibles and metals that are compound: it is exactly the reverse. Sulphur, phosphorus, carbon and the combustibles, on one hand, with lead, iron and the metals on the other, are elementary: the respective acids and calxes of these principles are the compounds. The phlogistians may therefore be said to have perceived the relation subsisting between these two classes of bodies upside-down, like the figures in a Camera Obscura; and surely their chamber was obscure enough, all honour to the light they managed to cast into it from the depths of their own minds. The images of things are painted on the nervous receiving-sheet inside the eyeball in the same fashion, namely, in the inverted position; but there is some cunning principle of rectification, whether in or beyond the retina, whereby those images are put on their feet again before presentation to the perception of the indwelling mind. Now this correcting power was wanting in the intellectual organ of the phlogistic schoolmen; their interior eye had probably not been sufficiently educated to the unsophisticated perception of outward truth by the cruel experience of their predecessors; and they consequently suffered that we might learn, not only to look exclusively at nature, but also to see things as they are. Their cogitative energy was still, in fact, greater than their perceptive capacity; as had been more and more signally the case with their three races of predecessors, the alchemists, the polypharmacists, and the physiological school of the ancient Greek movement in philosophy. Nobody who knows anything of Beccher and Stahl, for example, can doubt that they were the equals of Lavoisier and Dalton in all intellectual respects, excepting that Christian virtue of sacrificing the intellect itself on the altar of observation, while they were certainly their superiors in extent of culture and in aspiration. Assuredly this phlogiston of theirs was nothing but an *Idolum Specūs*, a figure cast upon the imagination from the phosphorescent walls of that cavernous part of the history of chemistry which they were traversing, but it was an image worthy of admiration and reverence. As to the generic idea of it, erroneous

though it was and is, it is extant in the science yet; for it is impossible to see wherein that of Caloric differs from it as a scientific conception, although elaborated with immensely greater precision, except that caloric is the matter of heat while phlogiston was the matter of fire. Both phlogiston and caloric are substances which have no existence whatever in the external world; they have both been the convenient, though fictitious representatives of natural realities, and they have both been eminently useful in standing for certain phenomena in their several days: but the latter creature of the materializing tendency of unripe science is not a whit better in essence than the former. Then as for the application of the phlogistic dogma to the details of chemistry, that was certainly wide of the mark, yet it glanced by the fact of the case in a remarkable manner: the doctrine was little short of being the half of the actual truth. It kept the calxes together, and the known acids too, as all so many analogons; so that, when Lavoisier arrived and discovered the composition of the mercurial calx, the remainder of his task was done to his hand, and all the other rusts and acids followed the oxide of quicksilver by a natural and easy consequence. Moreover, when Davy came on the scene, the classification of our phlogistians, as extended and enhanced by the great discovery grafted on it by the French chemistry, pointed not doubtfully to the alkalis and earths as being probably nothing but the rusts or oxides of metals difficult of separation from their ores; whereupon, with the help of electrolysis, he made the brilliant discovery of potassium and the other easily combustible metals. To sum up the whole matter, this phlogiston prepared the way for the balance, just as the balance heralded the Daltonian arithmetic of chemistry: it had done the gigantic task of putting the enormous huddle of known facts into order; and there they stood, awaiting the renovated eye of science in the person of Lavoisier.

It also served as a centre of coherence for the thoughts and new attempts of a race of splendid thinkers and industrious workmen, from Stahl down to Cavendish. But for phlogiston, less than half-truth though it was, the science of these clear-headed and adventurous men would have been but a crude heap, instead of an intimate and seemly combination of details; a mingling of all sorts of observations, not a melting of them into one substance; a clumsy puddingstone, or at best a somewhat confused granite, not a clear and many-crystalled quartz; a chaos of the senses, and not a creation of the mind. A great half-truth will be found at the core of the Lavoisierian, at the heart of the Daltonian, chemistries too; for man, at least considered as chemist, is destined to advance by a succession of

oblique steps, forward yet ever somewhat aside, for many a time to come; and the sooner he becomes aware of the fact the better. Not till then, at all events, shall he be able to show forth a childlike faith in the past, a manly contentment with the present, and a ripened trust in the future of science and of all generous endeavour. Not till then will he feel the succeeding æons of his vast existence, in every part of history, to be the onflowing of one river, the growing of one tree of life, or the rising as of one human being from infancy to age. The last of these is the truest image, in fact, that could be used. The playful and apparently successful childhood of chemistry may be said to have passed among those young-souled Greeks, from whom phlogiston came down: they asked such profound questions at Nature that they could not understand her motherly responses, yet the very putting of those questions foreshadowed the whole history of the science. Its busy but little-doing boyhood was spent in the East, under caliphs and physicians, whose very names are fragrant with romance; its ardent and imaginative pubescence, in the unbroken Christendom of the middle ages, amid the hum of scholasticism and under the shadow of Gothic architecture: and we have just seen something of its sturdy youth of somewhat positive effort during the reign of phlogiston. The fifth of its ages, that of victorious and self-confident manhood, now offers itself to the attention of the historical student: but it will be a relief to the strain of chemical discussion, to put in a few words about the men whose names are associated with the memory of the matter of fire, before proceeding to that still more remarkable epoch.

If phlogiston was not formally enunciated, or invented and applied in all its breadth, it was at all events announced in an intelligible manner by Joachim Beccher; a man of an eccentric and keen spirit, a scholar of liberal cultivation, and a wanderer upon the face of the earth. Little that is certain can be said about the particulars of his outward life. He was born at Spire in 1635, was chief doctor to the Electors of Mayence and Bavaria in succession, and subsequently the object of a world of persecution, although under the auspices of the Emperor. One cannot know how much or how little he may have drawn the enmity of his contemporaries upon him by defiance and waywardness; and it is certainly interesting to observe how frequently the Galileos, Keplers and Hallemannns of scientific history have been much to blame for the harsh entertainment they have received at the hands of a world, that is as impatient of disdain as it is placable by submission. It is not easy to avoid the suspicion that he must have been but 'a discomfortable cousin' at the best, and perhaps he drew untold comfort

and self-reliance, from the fact. Be that as it may, he was pursued with the utmost rigour of both the civil and the lynch law of his day, and had to betake himself to flight and expatriation. He fled first to Holland and afterwards to England, but both his travels in exile and his latter end are now lost in obscurity. Dumas avers that the envy of courtiers, and the persecution he everywhere brought on himself by his intolerable vanity, made him the most wretched of men; but even inordinate self-assertion, still more that over-valiant self-trust which is easily mistaken by the vain for the insolence of pride, is not without its secret joy, with which no stranger can intermeddle. It is therefore not inconceivable though surprising that, notwithstanding his erratic and peaceless career, he wrote largely on theology, politics, history, philology, mathematics and chemistry. In one of his chemical pieces, he describes an excellent portable furnace, full of little contrivances, and handy enough in its way; and it is to be inferred that there was a practical turn in the midst of his multifarious speculative tendencies. He was even more fiercely anti-scholastic than his turbulent predecessor, the raging Paracelsus himself. Standing out for the rights of experiment, he rejected the four elements, as well as the quintessence, fifth element or first matter of the later alchemists; but he did so only to promulgate four elements of his own, namely, fire, the earthy principle, the combustible element and the metallic one. The foundation of his chemical doctrine, in fact, was just a classification of material substances into fiery or imponderable bodies, earths, combustibles and metals. The latter two kinds of matter being subsequently understood to be analogous in so far as combustibility is concerned, this division was still further simplified. Fire was then the first kind of substance; earths, calxes and acids were the second; and combustibles, including both the metals and the common acid-yielding combustibles, such as brimstone and phosphorus, formed the third: fire, the products of combustion, and combustibles eventually constituting the logical triad of that chemistry which arose out of the protest and new classification of this singular reformer; and it is needless to shew how true and invaluable all this was, always deducting the materialization of fire—a thing with which, by the way, the science of this age should kindly sympathize, for it still abounds in materializations of the same sort. His great work was, let us rather say is, the *Physica Subterranea*, of which only one part remains. It is dedicated to the Almighty Compounder in a queer, familiar yet striking style, leaving the sympathetic reader in doubt as to whether it is *impious*, or merely *impious*, or actually though fantastically pious. It is true, to be sure, that Van Helmont inscribed his works to

Jehovah in a strain, which is as devout as it is foreign to the taste, if not to the spirit, of the present day. It were a becoming consecration, indeed, to put upon every grave production : but it ought to be written all over the book, and not only at the beginning or the end ; and it should surely be done in invisible and sympathetic lines, so that only the warm and understanding heart of the reader should be able to bring them out on the unostentatious page, and that for no eye but his own.

George Ernest Stahl, the elaborator of the phlogistic hypothesis, was inspired with his thought by the works of this uneasy Beccher. He adored the *Physica Subterranea* more especially. He calls it *Opus sine Parâ*, a work without a peer, *Primum ac Princeps*, first and foremost, *Liber undique et undique Primus*, a book everywhere and everywhere supreme—and so forth. Born at Anspach in 1660, twenty-five years after his master or intellectual sire, he was a physician, and a first-physician to dukes and kings, in Saxe-Weimar and at Berlin, till he died in 1734. His medical as well as his chemical works approve him a man of deep and wide views, or attempts to understand those parts of nature to which he belonged ; and it is well known that he is an important figure in the history of European medicine, while the Homœopathists of this contentious time of transition claim him as one of the forerunners or outriders of their hierophant. He was even a methodologist, and there lay his strength. His extensive information, gathered from many quarters, grew easily into a system within his mind. By nature and by cultivation he was an unrestrainable system-builder ; and, happily, his method, or principle of unity, was a good one for his sort of studies, especially for the chemistry of that day, which lay waiting for reduction to order after its agitation by the rough-handed Joachim of Spire. There was the particular work to do, here was the very man to do it ; and it was done. Under the influence of poor Paracelsus, as well as of his more immediate exemplar, he was an experimentalist as well as a dogmatist, an advocate for experience as well as for thought, a man of facts as well as of ideas. In short, the theory of chemistry, which has just been explained at some length, was mainly the result of his observative meditation ; and it is unnecessary to add anything to that explanation, until the movement against it under the conduct of Lavoisier comes to be considered.

If Beccher was odd as well as original in his way of thinking, Stahl was certainly original as well as odd in his way of writing. His style is the strangest motley. It is half Latin and half German. This cannot have been owing to ignorance, for he was a learned man, and had more than enough Latin for his purposes. Neither is it to be rashly attributed to indolence or carelessness,

for he was an industrious and painstaking chemist and physician. Certes, neither ignorance nor laziness were amongst his defects. Can it have been the sheer wilfulness of a Titanic and intellectually licentious spirit, like that of his elephantine and sportive countryman Richter in later times? Was there any inward necessity, of a personal and psychological kind, for this fantastic coat of many colours, in which he could not but invest his new thoughts, as seems to be the case of our own Carlyle? Or may it not have been a determined will to introduce, to the extent that he could, the writing of scientific works in the vernacular speech? Let our admiration and gratitude prevail with us to suppose the last of these is the true explanation of this ludicrous characteristic of his, for in that case he would have one claim more on our regard; a claim which should have peculiar force in a popular dissertation like this, for it is clear that science could never have been discussed before the unprofessional reader, until good German and English had been substituted in our books for bad Latin. Since, then, Doctor Stahl may really be considered as one of the tutelary geniuses of scientific literature, the concluding words of his five folios on the Foundations of Chemistry cannot be without some interest in the present connexion. It is impossible to exhibit the grotesque effect of the mixture of Latin and German, with a sprinkling of Greek, in a translation; but the impatient etceteras are faithfully taken from the text, and they will convey some impression of the glorious absurdity of the original. The recipe of the folio is this—three parts of good Dog-Latin, two of German, one of Etceteras, and a dash of new Greek, to say nothing particular about a pinch of Arabic.

‘As for the use of these things, both for science (that is, the excessive delectation and the cultivation of the mind,) and for purposes which are physical, economical, civil, &c., all that has been said is worthy, &c. :—I advise my noble readers to ruminate over what has been said, &c. But I warn them altogether against those meteoric studies, and vain promisings, opinions, speculations, for fear their mind should ruin their conscience, fame, time, faculty, &c. Wherefore I warn them away from that vulgarly so-called alchemy and its foolish hopes, for it were surely absurd to hope that God would make a man rich because he has made him wise: and as for doing good with it, that is mere knavery to be spit upon. Our Lord God wishes to have the poor and the rich together, although he could soon make us all rich. Morrhosius, in his epistle concerning transmutation, which is certainly worth reading, for it contains some excellent things, tells how Kelly the Englishman got a certain tincture in a wonderful manner, namely, on condition he should

dower poor virgins with it; but while he toyed with it, and wished to see if he really knew the craft of the thing, he actually wasted it all in trials; and there happened to him one of those fates, whereof we have no examples now-a-days: wherein is to be seen how their own inconsiderate nature and perversity, especially in youth, can bring men to ruin. Well, truly, does God ever deal with us, even while the divine goodness denies us smiles in order to award us wrath, &c.' So ends the *Fundamenta Chymiae*, and so the world takes its last farewell of alchemy, with the wrath of heaven and an &c.!

In addition to these two patriarchs of the science, it was under the illumination and guidance of this Pillar of Fire that there lived, laboured, and prevailed some of the finest spirits that ever devoted their talents to the work of chemistry. Amongst others, whom the particular limitations and the general scope of this short review render it undesirable even to name, there were Scheele of Sweden, Priestley and Cavendish of England, Black and Watt of Scotland, as well as the great Frenchman, Lavoisier himself, at the commencement of his career. To say nothing of the modest and secluded Scheele's discovery of new solid and liquid bodies of every kind, it was these men who began and carried forward that pneumatic chemistry, or chemistry of the *gases*, which has done so much for the arts of life, which has also been incidental to the transformation of the science, and into which it is now necessary to look, both because it arose among the phlogistians, and because it led to that memorable expansion of modern chemistry about to be described as the epoch of Lavoisier.

It was long till the vital air was clearly understood to be a substance essentially similar to the earth and the sea; and there is little wonder that it should not, it is so thin, transparent, evanescent, invisible and mysterious. The result of the earliest thoughts of mankind on the subject, in so far as these are embodied in the young languages of the world, seems always to imply some supposed analogy between the impalpable breath of the physical heavens and the inscrutable spirit of God himself. The winds were *Æolian* powers, or rather potentates, passing through the omnipresent sea of life, now rushing with demoniacal hurry athwart the scene, and now gently stirring it like the breath of angels. The very word *Spirit*, in Hebrew, Greek and Latin, is significant of breath. It appears that the force of inspiration, or the coming of god or demon into an ecstatic person, is expressed by the word *Wareem*, the winds, in Hindostan; and the very name cannot but remind one of the divine *Aura* of the ancient Romans, the sacred breeze of poetic or pro-

phetic rapture. Let facts of this sort be the indications, either that the mind of man in history has ascended step by step from material towards spiritual conceptions; or, contrariwise, that he has come down from a primeval life of ideas into that of nature and the senses, until he has lost the idea in the symbol, and thereby become materialized: there is one conclusion that remains the same in either case, namely, that it was only in comparatively modern times that the truly crass and unreservedly material nature even of atmospheric air, not to mention the other (long unknown) gases, was plainly recognised. Nor has that ærial ocean, in which we are submerged, ceased to be the inalienable symbol of whatever is spiritual and divine, even now that we know all about it. It is still the appropriate type for the inflowing of the Catholic spirit into the private soul of the saint, although its soft and secret substance has been weighed in the balance, solidified in many a tangible compound, and made out of stones by the hand of art. Notwithstanding all our experiments, fixations and recoveries, it is just as beautiful, as mysterious, and as necessary to life as ever; for science does not destroy the poetical or the spiritual significancy of nature at all, it only removes it to a greater depth. 'Thou canst not tell whence it cometh, nor whither it goeth.'

Galileo was the first to form something like a right conception of the ponderous character of the atmosphere. It had been found, during the erection of certain public works by the then reigning Grand-duke of Tuscany, that water could not be drawn up a pump any higher than some two-and-thirty feet. The piston having been raised toward the upper end of a tall pump, the water followed with due fidelity so far, but it would not budge beyond a certain height. The schoolmen of that day had found an easy explanation of the rise of water in pumps, when the pistons are drawn up, in the famous proposition, or rather figure of speech, that Nature abhors a void:—the air-tight piston being elevated, an empty space is left between the surface of the water and the piston, and therefore the water goes up to fill it, without a sensible instant of delay. But they had now to mend their maxim, because it appeared that Nature did not unreservedly and implacably abhor a void after all; inasmuch as even water, the very type of mobility and obedience, would not follow the piston an inch above its own particular point of choice:—and they were thereby driven from the ineffectual, but not unpoetical, mysticism of their fathers to something like sophistication, for they were fain to assert that she abhors it only to the height of ten yards or so! It is never the originators of a great but useful scientific error, nor yet its true and industrious believers, but its indolent perpetuators who will not move to the music of the new

fact and the new time, that are ridiculous, shifty, ambiguous and not respectable.

The case was now put to the discoverer of the satellites of Jupiter, and he seems to have seen into the secret at once. It was reserved, however, for his pupil Torricelli to establish and work out his ready conjecture. The celebrated Pascal repeated, verified and extended Torricelli's experiments. The truth of the thing, in brief, was and is just this:—air, though comparatively light, is positively heavy, having a weight of its own. The experiments of these men showed that a square inch of it, carried up from the surface of the earth to the top of the atmosphere, is no less than 15 lbs. in weight. It is this weight of the atmosphere, 15 lbs. on every square inch, that pushes water into the void left by the updrawn piston of a pump; and there is, of course, a limit beyond which it cannot push the water, namely, the point of height at which the column of water in the pump-tube is exactly balanced by the weight of the atmosphere. It is just a question of balance; 15 lbs. can support only 15 lbs.,—a thing which every body understands now-a-days, thanks to Galileo, Torricelli and Blaise Pascal, the seer, the discoverer and the verifier of the fact.

In the time of Van Helmont, who flourished at the beginning of the seventeenth century, the workmen in certain German mines were molested, just as our colliers still are, by poisonous choke-damp and explosive fire-damp; that is to say, (for the words were German, though only too easily domesticated in England), by suffocating and by fiery vapours, the former of which put out life silently but summarily, while the latter might blow its unfortunate victims to pieces. In sarcastic playfulness with the popular superstition regarding these guardians of the mineral treasures of the old earth, that singular man imposed upon them the name of ghosts or gases; but it must be confessed that he knew little or nothing positive about them. Boyle was probably the first to suspect that some solid bodies do in certain circumstances, when they are heated for instance, throw off artificial airs, resembling the common atmospheric gas in thinness and in elasticity, as well as in dryness and permanency, but differing from it he could not well tell how. It is related of Hoffman that he got himself into much trouble with the ecclesiastics of his place and time, who embittered his latter days not a little on account of his physical criticisms, by averring that the spirits, by whom certain foolish students, addicted to midnight magical incantations over chaufers glowing within chalk-drawn circles and pentagrams, had been seduced, frightened, floored, otherwise maltreated, and hardly suffered to escape with their beggarly lives, were undoubtedly evil spirits or caco-demons, as they had

been pronounced by a respectable bench of theological judges,—but the spirit of avarice to begin with, and the spirit of charcoal to carry on the process!

It was young Black, ~~however~~ the greatest chemist Scotland has produced, and the discoverer of that fact of latent heat which Watt has embodied in the steam-engine, that ~~took the first positively chemical step in this progress.~~ He discovered that limestone (or chalk or marble or oyster-shell,) when burned in the kiln and thereby rendered quick, parts with a kind of air in which no animal can breathe and live; and also that it is owing to its setting free this air or gas that the change from inactive limestone to caustic quicklime is due. He called it fixed air, imprisoned in the rock till the furnacc or oil of vitriol or the spirit of salt extricated it from its fixture. He perceived and proved that this fixed air was neither more nor less than of the nature of an acid, but existing, alone of all acids, in the airy or gaseous state; not in the liquid or solid one, as was common and world-like. Thus was the fertile conception that there may exist many different kinds of airy matter, just as there are many kinds of solid and liquid substances, differing as much from the gas of the atmosphere as the vitriolic oil or the fuming liquor of Libavius or the essence of turpentine differs from the water of the ocean, or as marble differs from sandstone and sandstone from alabaster, fairly inaugurated. It was a magnificent discovery, and it was made at Edinburgh almost within the memory of its present inhabitants. The late venerable Lord Glenlee, who had been the companion of Black, Hutton, Robertson, Adam Smith and all the intellectual magnates of old Edinburgh, once described to us the sensation it excited amongst the learned of that critical city; and it must still be avowed that it is the greatest discovery in natural science that has ever been made there. We also remember a conversation with Doctor Chalmers, who retained his generous love of science to the last, concerning this chemistry of the gases. Flinging himself back into the last century, after having condescended on the latest improvements in organic analysis, he exclaimed,—‘Yes, it is all very beautiful; but think of Black catching fixed air, and discerning it to be an acid, at a time when nobody thought of such things: that was the great stroke; it was a very great thing to do.’ Yes, be the orator’s judgment re-echoed now, for it is the first step that is ever the heroic step. It has to be taken in the dark, it has to be taken alone, it can be taken only by a man who is capable of taking all the past along with him, and it cannot be taken by him on whom the bounded present has already crystallized, changing him to a pillar of salt.

Soon after this initiative had been taken by Joseph Black,

Priestley invented an easy way of collecting and handling gaseous bodies, the pneumatic trough with its jars, and actually came upon some nine kinds of gas (all differing from ordinary air and from one another) in the course of a few busy and even stormy years,—for poor Priestley was as restless a controversialist in theology and philosophy as ever Beccher or any of the alchemists had been, and had to undergo a world of trouble in connexion with his disputations career. Scheele had meanwhile been making conquests of the same sort in an obscure Swedish town, with no apparatus but phials and bladders, and had added two or three more to the list of new gases. All Europe followed these sagacious leaders, Cavendish the discoverer of hydrogen, Watt who first suspected water to be composed of two gases, Rutherford the discoverer of nitrogen, Lavoisier the interpreter though not the first discoverer of oxygen, and the rest; until everybody has at length become aware that gases are just the steams of liquids which boil at immensely low points of temperature, these liquids being the liquefactions of solid bodies which melt at temperatures lower still, and that therefore there may be no end to the number of the kinds of gaseous matter, precisely as there is no known limit to the vast variety of liquids and solids. One species, or rather a variable mixture of two or three, composed of carbon and hydrogen, is made in the outskirts of nearly every town now-a-days in enormous quantities, and then sent away from a huge Priestleyan trough and jar, as from a heart, to circulate through a system of metallic arteries for the purpose of lighting the houses of the rich, the chambers of the poor and the halls of the public, the incredulity of Walter Scott notwithstanding. Hoffman's spirit of charcoal, the fixed air of Black, the carbonic acid of the present nomenclature, is studiously crushed into bottles of soda-water by stout machinery, to be quaffed by the luxurious and the ailing before it has time to fly away. Our cottons and linens are bleached by chlorine. Great balloons are filled with the phlogisticated air or hydrogen of Cavendish, the lightest of corporeal bodies, to carry men of science and fools with singular impartiality. Oxygen and hydrogen are separated from chemical union with one another in water, suffered to remain mechanically mingled, and then made to unite again by combustion at the nozzle of the oxy-hydrogen blow-pipe, so as to produce a number of useful and beautiful results. The arsenic that may lurk about the putrid remains of a dead and buried man is transformed by an easy process into arseniuretted hydrogen gas, so as by its decomposition to bring the metal that laid him low before the eye of a jury. The spirit of hartshorn is now understood to be but a compound of nitrogen and hydrogen, called ammonia, absorbed and probably in com-

bination with water; while the old spirit of salt, or muriatic acid, is just an aqueous solution of hydrochloric gas: and the knowledge of these things is daily made use of in the manufacture of those indispensable liquors. The nitrogen is seduced into something like an unwilling chemical union with the oxygen of the atmosphere, by a device borrowed from nature, so as to yield the nitrate of lime, the nitrate of potassa or saltpetre, the nitrate of soda, and (by a secondary process) the nitric acid or nitrate of water itself, that invaluable oxydant and solvent of the metallurgist and the chemist. Hydrogen, oxygen, nitrogen and chlorine, the four gaseous elements now known, (to say nothing of fluorine, which is doubtless destined to be proved a true gas) and a great number of gaseous compounds of these simple airs with one another, and with both liquid and solid kinds of matter, are not only daily prepared with certainty and precision, but hourly transferred from combination to combination, in the operations of the manufactory and the laboratory. In fact, there is no end to the applications of this pneumatic chemistry, which took its rise within the (old) college of Edinburgh from the mind of a student of medicine, who had been faithfully brought up in the Stahlian creed by Dr. Cullen, at once his preceptor and his disciple. The chemistry of the gases, in truth, is one of several achievements which unite to throw something like an imaginative lustre around those crowds of nomadic young men, who yearly congregate in the metropolis of Scotland for the study of physic. Within the indefinite circumstances and the questionable appearance of the student of any current session, there may be working and striving towards effective utterance some conception, which will one day raise him to the companionship of the accomplished and much-accomplishing, though mild, retiring and delicate Joseph Black, who lived as fine a life of science as was ever lived, and died with a cup of milk unspilt in his hand.

But neither the multifarious applications of the pneumatic chemistry, nor yet the light it threw on a multitude of natural operations, was its greatest result. Its relation to the growth of the science was still more important than these things. It was nothing less than a critical momentum in the history of chemistry at large. It rendered the existing theory painfully too narrow; the phlogistic hypothesis and classification could not stretch to its demands; the tree began to burst its bark. That admirable phantom phlogiston could not contain, keep in order, and govern all those new discoveries. It was no longer sufficient for its historical purpose. Chemistry was growing too great for its antiquated rule. The very discoveries, which would never have been made but for phlogiston, were turning against it almost as soon as they were made. As is ever the case, his own progeny

rose up to devour this Saturn; his own dogs wheeled round on this Actæon to rend him: and the memory of Thales and all the Greeks was now to be done to death for more than age. But the old fellow stood gallantly at bay: and it is notorious that the very men, whose discoveries brought all this tendency to mutiny and revolution about, stood by the falling order of things to the last. Neither Cavendish nor Priestley ever abandoned the matter of fire. True to Empedocles and Stahl, they persisted in conceiving of hydrogen as phlogisticated and of oxygen as dephlogisticated airs respectively; even after the ponderable constitution of water had been suggested by Watt, discovered by Cavendish himself, and completely interpreted by Lavoisier. Cavendish, indeed, gave over chemical investigation in disgust, and betook himself to electricity, as soon as it became clear that the new theory of chemistry had won the day. The restless and hasty, but inventive and generous Priestley in his old age took refuge from his enemies in America; and persevered in the writing of long querulous letters to the Academy at Paris about phlogiston, after it had been taken up by the roots with universal acclamation and consigned to the Hortus Siccus of history. Old doctrines and beliefs are the true mandrakes, many-rooted in the long-trodden soil; and they utter their cries of pain when they are torn up, like those living plants of old and fabulous renown. Alas, the superlative difficulty, and that not only the intellectual, but even more especially the moral difficulty of loosening the mind from the firm-seeming coast of prescriptive and contemporary theory, and of thereupon tempting the untried deep where no credible land appears to rise, has never been handled with love and justice, whether by poets or historians. More commonly the apostle of the new insults over the senility of the prophet of the old idea:—and yet the New Testament might surely have taught Christendom how to think, feel and speak about every foregoing dispensation. On the other hand, the pain with which an industrious man, whose nature it is to love the past, to revere its great names, to delight in its excellent construction, to cling to its established ways, to take a paternal pride in his own contributions to its citizenship, and, in fine, to embrace it with all the arms of his soul, must feel the island-home of his thoughts and hopes begin to move under his tread as if it were no island, can be altogether understood only by the high-hearted and adventurous mariner, who has pitched his tent on some pleasant, but volcanic and temporary margent the day before its going down again to the deep. To bring this sad reflection to a merry end, however, it must also be confessed that there is a lazy conservative spirit which is as ridiculous and comic as this earnest passion for the good old

ways is tragic and far from ignoble. Perhaps the quaintest instance on record of that funny indolence was the case of a worthy professor of chemistry at Aberdeen. He had allowed some years to pass over Davy's brilliant discovery of potassium and its congeneric metals without a word about them in his lectures. At length the learned doctor was concussed by his colleagues on the subject, and he condescended to notice it:—'Both potash and soda are now said to be metallic oxides, said he; the oxides, in fact, of two metals, called potassium and sodium by the discoverer of them, one Davy in London—a verri troublesome person in chemistry.'

It was Antoine Laurent Lavoisier, who first felt the pressure of this necessity for a renovated theory of Chemistry, and at once began to construct it, say rather to woo it from the opening bosom of nature, where it lay ready to come forth at the call of him that knew the word of power. Dumas has triumphantly shown that his countryman had formed the idea of his great revolution at the very outset of his career, and that even before many of the pneumatic discoveries of the Swedish and British phlogistians had been made and published. There can be no manner of doubt, in fact, of the single-handed originality of the French lawgiver of chemistry in bringing about that transition, from the era of phlogiston and the cupel to that of oxygen and the balance, which constitutes the turning point of the history now under review. It is easy and social to speak with effusion about the division of labour and the grandeur of combination, but it seems generally to be individual men that do the greater business of science and of the world after all. Institutes, academies, royal societies, have all been good; but a man like Lavoisier is better than them all. German, British, American associations have their important purposes to serve, and they subserve them well; but an opinion just begins to prevail, that in these days we run some danger of being associated to death. Excessive association certainly tends to the production of weakness in the individual unit, if the resulting whole is strong; and it is fortunate that there are some men so unsocial as to dwell apart, drawing inspiration from the quiet past, from the instant universe itself, and from the twittering dawn that is ever arising in the east.

Strange to say, although Lavoisier was early an academician, there was not a little of this individuality and isolation in his character, notwithstanding that he did not resemble Stahl so much in this respect as Dalton did,—but he is never to be compared with these epochal men, his sole co-equals in the history of chemistry, in largeness and energy of intellectual

structure, while he may be confidently pronounced their superior in lucidity of the understanding. Born at Paris on the 16th of August in 1743, the son of a rich merchant capable of appreciating his child, he was left very much to the guidance of his own intellectual instincts. Having studied mathematics, astronomy, botany, all with some degree of particularity, he at length took lessons in chemistry at the hands of old Rouelle, an odd and extravagant enthusiast who professed the science at Paris in those days. A young man of many talents and accomplishments, the world of science lay all before him and invited his devotion. Circumstances conspired with his peculiar genius to lead him into those chemical recesses or *Physica Subterranea* of nature, into which he was one day to shed a whole atmosphere of light. Dumas mentions with honest pride how, while yet a youth of twenty-two, his hero kept himself six weeks in total darkness, in order to intensify the sensibility of his eye to the perception of faint degrees of luminosity; also how he renounced the solicitations and blandishments of Parisian society for the secluded pursuit of science; and how he put himself on short commons of bread and milk, when he found that the want of air and exercise was going to do him harm. These are probably things, one might say, which it is more difficult to do in Paris than in London or at Edinburgh, otherwise his countryman and celebrator would scarcely have thought them so notable; yet they do indicate a spirit of quiet self-determination on the part of the young discoverer. It likewise appears that he soon understood the scope of the great task which began to unfold its proportions before him, and he made ready to undertake it with a deal of cool-bloodedness. Perceiving he should need a good income for his purposes, he busied himself to obtain the appointment of a farmer-general of the public revenues. When he succeeded, the chemists said he had forsaken chemistry, and the farmers looked askance upon him as an interloper; but he eventually approved himself the best of farmers and the greatest of the chemists of his day. In timely consolidation of his monetary foundation, he at the same time obtained the hand of the daughter of one of his colleagues in the financial trade, a lady who married Thompson the American, commonly called Count Rumford, after the execution of her immortal Lavoisier.

An academician at twenty-five years of age, he was put at the head of the governmental saltpetre works at thirty-three, during the ministry of Turgot; and, after several other little public dignities had been conferred on him, he was made a member of the famous commission on weights and measures in 1790. The year after this he produced his treatise on the territorial wealth of France, and the Constituent Assembly printed it at the ex-

pense of the commonwealth. It moreover seems to be the unanimous verdict of his countrymen, at least in those days, that he behaved himself in a manly and business-like way in all his public capacities, such as they were. But within all this busy and successful outward existence there moved an orb of thought and labour, which was of incalculably more importance to the world. The revenue-farmer was working out a vast scheme of chemical discovery and doctrine all the time. Beginning in 1772, in the course of his thirtieth year, he published some forty memoirs in the Transactions of the Academy by 1786, within the space of fifteen years, all of them bearing on his new theory of chemical science. It is also recorded to his honour that, though a rich man, an eminent public character, and a great legislator in science, he engaged in some of the most disgusting of chemical investigations from motives of humanity, thereby adding works of supererogation to those great labours which have given him a name to live for ever in the history of chemistry and human progress. Take him all in all, he must have been an industrious, devoted, aspiring, public-spirited, virtuous, and really great man; as he was certainly an accomplished man of science and the first of chemists. As a man of intellect he belonged to his city and his age; that is to say, he was a positivist, a disciple of Condillac in philosophy (if philosophy it might be called), a man of the senses and the judgment according to sense, essentially if not formally a materialist, a man of science not a philosopher, analytic and rhetorical rather than a synthesist and a maker, acute not subtle, crystal-clear but not profound. What with his young and demonstrative enthusiasm in pursuit, his intimacy with Laplace and many of the greater men of his day, his liberal public spirit, his perspicacious and sceptical mind, his keen but not ungenial criticism of the past, and his discoveries in physical science, it would be difficult to find a more favourable and substantially excellent example of the kind of man and thinker which the eighteenth century could produce, in France and at Paris, than this our lucid Lavoisier. Yet all his services and all his fine qualities could not save him from the revolutionary scaffold. Upon some paltry accusation of their having authorized or winked at the putting of too much water on the Republic's tobacco, a number of the farmers-general were condemned to death; and the great chemist was one of them. It was in vain that he hid himself in some innermost cabinet of the academy: he was dragged forth like a skulking malefactor, insulted by a mock-trial, and beheaded with the rest of the suspected publicans. It seems now to aggravate this disgusting scene in the historical eyes of Dumas, but it surely relieves its ignominy in so far as the raging populace were

concerned at the time, to think that the guillotine swept off the head, not of the crowned and illustrious Lavoisier, but of farmer-general Number Five. The truly pathetic circumstance, connected with this homicide, was the fact that the discoverer was just at the middle of his work, as he supposed. These are the last two sentences he ever wrote:—‘This is not the place to enter into any details concerning organized bodies; indeed I have purposely avoided that subject, and that is the reason why I have refrained from speaking of the phenomena of respiration, sanguification, and animal heat. I shall return some day soon to these subjects.’ He never returned—in the body; but his spirit, the clear and unmistakable spirit with which he questioned the unknown, the candid and obedient spirit wherewith he listened for the answer of nature, is with us still, the nobler portion of the legacy he left with his disciples. May it never leave them! While the chemists of the rising generation endeavour to assimilate, in their proper personalities, somewhat of the profound insight into principles of the Greek physiologists, the religious industry of Ghebir and his pharmacologers, the intellectual ambition of Friar Bacon and the alchemists, the inventiveness and method of Stahl and the pneumatic leaders, may they always be strong enough to subordinate those shining qualities to the incorruptible common sense of the great French chemist and his disciples; and, if still newer intellectual manifestations are now about to be evolved with the development of science, may the same principles of common sense accompany chemistry and its explorers, as the ballast of the good ship, for the name of the slaughtered Lavoisier can never cease to be whispered from ear to ear even on the strangest seas.

It is illustrative of his inborn disposition to cope with the greatest questions, as well as of the power of an old idea in a science, that the earliest spontaneous investigation of Lavoisier actually drew its initiative from the dogma of Thales concerning water as the first and fountal element of things. That primitive conception, in truth, had never quite disappeared from the horizon of physics; although water was early reduced to the inferior dignity of being no more than one of four elemental natures, as has been explained above. The fountal or generative character of that all-important liquid had been advanced by Van Helmont in later times in connexion with an especial chemical instance. That converted alchemist maintained that water was convertible into earth by prolonged boiling, an opinion, apparently grounded on experiment, which had the continued countenance of Beccher and Stahl. The transcendental element of the old chemistry, in fact, was long-lived and tenacious. The inordinate love of sublimity and unity was not easily extinguished, even in so me-

thodical a spirit as Stahl himself. He retained a provisional region for facts and thoughts beyond the reach of Phlogiston. The belief, or rather the apprehension, of something far more wondrous than metallic calxes and the matter of fire formed the back-ground on which his particular chemical doctrine was painted; and through the visible darkness of that distance there loomed two or three shadowy figures, pointing inwards to some land of promise. These did not interfere with the foreground, but they made it feel unsatisfactory. They poured a kind of mild and sad contempt upon it. They provoked an undefinable longing in the mind for something they could never give. It therefore behoved the man of a new time, it behoved the young Lavoisier to lay them to rest in one way or another, to settle the questions they suggested once for all, to discover the limits of chemical enquiry, in one word, to understand without mistake the boundaries of his sphere; and, happily, those lingering ghosts remained in such a questionable shape that he could speak to them. He asked not authority, not reason, not imagination; for none of these could tell, and he knew it: he asked Nature if water could or could not be turned into stone, and asked in such a way that she could not but accord an intelligible and also an unmistakable answer. He took an alembic, which may be described as an air-tight still in which the condensed steam or distilled liquor always flows back into the boiler, weighed it, put an ascertained quantity of water into it, made it air-tight, and set the water a-boiling; the steam rising, getting condensed, and trickling back continually through the tubular arms of the pelican. It was kept boiling in this way for a hundred-and-one nights and days, circulating inside the air-tight apparatus. At the end of that period, the whole affair had lost no weight. The pelican or alembic had lost seventeen grains. The water had gained weight, and it was muddy with earthy particles. When this muddied water was evaporated to dryness, there remained 20 grains of earth, 17 grains of which had clearly been worn out of the substance of the vessel; but where had the other 3 grains come from? Lavoisier at once assigned them to the incidental errors of experiment, and he does appear to have been wonderfully easily satisfied on the point; for surely an error of three grains in twenty was too large to be overlooked in an attempt to solve so great and venerable a question. The fact is that the three odd grains came from the water itself, the original water doubtless containing that amount of saline and organic matter in solution. But this experimentalist was right in the main, and the earth, which Van Helmont and Beccher traced to the transformation of water, was thus discovered to have come from the earthy vessel in which the water had been

pertinaciously boiled. Scheele investigated this very question in another manner; he analyzed the earth produced, and found it to be the same as the stuff of the apparatus. The experiments of the French and Swedish chemists, taken together, told with fatal effect. The day of scepticism had come at last, for chemistry was growing great enough to fill the imagination without the help of transcendental dogma, and the new students were merciless experimenters.

The notable circumstances in this experiment of Lavoisier, as has been pointedly urged by Dumas, is the use of the balance. Till this weighing of the alembic, the water and the residue, the balance had not been used in chemistry as an implement of research; even Scheele had an eye only to the quality, not at all to the quantity, of the earthy matter, when he made his analysis or rather his testing of it. We have already seen how the phlogistians conceived and taught that, when a calx united with a quantity of phlogiston, it had lightness added to it, not weight, and therefore the resultant metal was not so heavy as the original calx. In fact then, so long as phlogiston, assumed to be the principal agent in chemical operation, was supposed to be even lighter than nothing, the balance could not possibly be introduced into chemistry as an instrument of investigation. Accordingly, when Lavoisier ordered a fine balance to be made with a view to its employment in research, the fate of phlogiston was sealed. The very thought of the balance implied the perception, by him who first thought of it, of the central idea of all positive chemistry, namely, that every chemical operation ends in an equation; if 100 grains, ounces or pounds of any substance whatsoever are burned, distilled, or in any way altered by a chemical process, then 100 pounds, ounces or grains of material must be accounted for after the operation; if 100 grains or hundred-weights of wood are consumed by fire, the 100 must be found, when all is done, in the ashes, the water and the carbonic acid resulting from the combustion, for nothing is ever lost. Weight was, for this intelligent and resolute stranger on the arena of chemistry, an immutable thing in nature. He saw without a doubt that the opposite of gravity, namely, the levity of the schoolmen, was a mere negation; a relative term, not a positive reality; a no, not a yes. This original perception, or first act of insight, was the starting-point of his career. It was the first-fruit of his happy genius; and, thank heaven, there were also vouchsafed to him industry, courage, talent and wealth, sufficient for its fulfilment and elaboration: he had not to teach a day-school, attended by scrubby little boys with bare feet and with satchels on their backs, like Dalton during a considerable part of his life;

and therefore he was comparatively rapid in his progress, although he had to work and write during not a few years before he was either listened to or understood—a kind of thing which posterity always likes to forget.

After what has been mentioned, it is easy to understand how Lavoisier should have communicated the following note to the Academy so early as the 1st November 1772, when only in his thirtieth year, before the discovery of oxygen gas, and before the full development of chemical pneumatics, which has been sketched above:—‘I have lately discovered that where sulphur is burned there is produced an acid with increase of weight; and it is the same with phosphorus. That increase of weight comes from the fixation of a prodigious quantity of air. If the metals also, when calcined, increase in weight, it is just from a similar fixation of air, and I can prove it by experiment. In fact, if I take a metallic calx and heat it with carbon in shut vessels, then at the moment when that calx is reduced to the metallic state,—at the moment, for example, when litharge (the calx of lead) is changed into metallic lead, there reappears the air which had become fixed when the metallic lead had previously been made into a calx, and you may collect an aerial product at least a thousand times more bulky than the solid litharge employed.’ ‘This experiment,’ it is added, ‘appears to me to be one of the most interesting that has been made since Stahl:’—and so indeed it was, for it involved the superseding of the Stahlian view of, and way of looking at, the phenomena of chemistry. This experiment, in truth, clearly contained the discovery that when brimstone and phosphorus are changed by combustion into acids, and when a metal is burned to a calx, the change is owing, not to the giving out of phlogiston by these combustibles respectively, but to their absorption of and chemical combination with large quantities of some ponderable kind of air. But nobody saw its vast importance except the experimentalist himself. So late as 1778, six years after the observation was made known, Macquer had a great load taken off his stomach (to use his own expression in a letter) by finding, after all due ventilation of the matter among his scientific gossips, that phlogiston was far from having any need of going to the wall yet. Be it repeated once more, with deep and affectionate respect, that it is no easy thing to give over a cherished theory: it is almost as difficult as to discover a new one; and it is only the frivolous and changeable inventor of new-fangled conceits, or the light-hearted minion of every glittering innovator, that refuses to do homage to the loyal spirit of the honest conservative. We remember with how much tenderness, we had almost said with what a tone of sadness, and sense of injury, the late Doctor Hope chid one of the expectant

graduates of the College^a at Edinburgh, on the occasion of the public defence of their medical theses in 1839, for entertaining the undemonstrable Ammonium-view of the constitution of the ammoniacal salts. The venerable professor retained his well-grounded fidelity to good old Ammonia, saying that he had 'hoped it should at least last all his days.'

Lavoisier knew the worth, and anticipated the future value, of his young and yet immature idea; and that was enough. Dumas has called the particular attention of chemists to the fact, accordingly, that although it was in 1772 that his hero began the interchange of preliminary shots, it was not till 1783, eleven years later and in the course of his forty-first year, that he fairly gave battle to phlogiston. Till that period, says the historian, Lavoisier seemed to have retreated from his position, in the opinion of the superficial. But it was only because he had not yet collected and organized a strong enough array of facts for the defence of his proposals. In truth, after having been eleven years engaged in the working out of his theory, Lavoisier was in the glorious minority of one, in so far as the chemists were concerned: he had only one disciple, and that one was his friend Laplace, the astronomer. It was not till 1787, when the reformer was forty-four years of age and a veteran in science, that Fourcroy began to teach both the phlogiston hypothesis and the oxygen theory in his public lectures, and to draw a comparison between them to the advantage of the latter. Berthollet joined the new cause the same year. Guyton Morveau, Monge, and gradually all the world, including Great Britain, followed their leaders at last. Then, after everybody was converted to the new views, and after the academicians had aided our discoverer in the construction of a nomenclature fitted for the expression and illustration of the new chemistry, it began to be everywhere discussed and applauded as the doctrine of the French chemists forsooth! 'This new blow was very painful to him,' writes his admirable vindicator:—'That theory, he cried, 'is not, as I hear it called, is not the theory of the French chemists, it is mine own; it is a possession which I claim at the hands of my contemporaries and posterity.' Much was also said, of course, about those things which he owed to Priestley, Cavendish, Scheele. He owed them much; yet he owed them only facts, and facts distorted by the false medium through which their discoverers saw them, but facts which never conducted them to any such theory, facts which easily fell into order under his theory, and facts that he discovered for the most part almost as soon as themselves. He owed them not a ray of thought: he owed them obstruction. Nor were good-natured and impartial critics slow to remind a generous cosmopolitan public that Jean Rey, (and

who knows whom besides?) had previously found that metals were heavier after than before combustion or calcination and did then contain air; but they reminded neither the world nor themselves that the invaluable discovery remained as barren as ice, until the radiance of Lavoisier's searching spirit made it flow over the plain, bringing all manner of fruits out of the willing earth, and going down to bear rich fleets upon its bosom.

It were impossible, within our limits, to trace the succession of particulars in the progress of Lavoisier's career; suffice it that it was arduous, singlehanded, and victorious in his own lifetime. The crowning moment was perhaps the following discovery:—Oxygen had been discovered by Priestley and by himself; he had also ascertained that it is the oxygen of the atmospheric air that becomes fixed (or absorbed and combined with) when brimstone is burnt or a metal calcined; so that the calx of quicksilver was known to contain at least mercury and oxygen, whatsoever else it might contain. He therefore took a known weight of mercurial rust, and drove the oxygen out of it by heat (for simple heating decomposes that oxide); but did so in such an apparatus as enabled him to catch and retain that oxygen, as well as to preserve the liberated quicksilver also. He next recalcined this same mercury, by means of the same oxygen as had just been expelled from the original calx employed; and he thereby obtained the same weight of the calx of mercury as had been introduced into the apparatus at the beginning of the experiment. This was an express illustration of the fact that the red rust of quicksilver is a compound of nothing ponderable but mercury and oxygen, instead of quicksilver being (as had been so long and loyally believed) a compound of its own calx with the positively light phlogiston. When it was made out that the sum of the weights of the mercury and the oxygen, obtainable by heat from any known weight of mercurial calx, is exactly equal to that weight, the experimental demonstration was complete.

The substance of the Lavoisierian chemistry may be briefly summed up in a few paragraphs, but that without being careful to assign each particular to its author, seeing the central facts and the great vivifying truth of the whole system were Lavoisier's own unmistakable handiwork.

§ 1. Water is not the element of all things, not the first of material forms, not the beginning of creation. It is not even the best or highest in rank, as Pindar expresses it, of four or any other number of elements. It is not an element at all: it is the resulting unity of two elements in combination, hydrogen and oxygen. It is the rust or calx of hydrogen, as iron-rust is the calx of iron, as the oxide of mercury is the calx of quick-

silver: it is the oxide of the gaseous metal hydrogen. It is curious to take notice of the changing fortunes of this sweet blood of nature in the history of chemistry. First the matrix of the whole universe, then only one of four elements, though the chief of the quaternion, more latterly looked upon as at least an altogether peculiar and calx-producing principle, and at last discovered to be itself nothing but a liquid product of combustion; one oxyde among many, the mere ashes of so much burnt hydrogen, a common compound of two out of a large number of elements. Yet this composition of water was a critical discovery in its day: for some years the whole science revolved around it; and it is still the typical illustration of the chemistry of analysis and synthesis. James Watt of the Steam-engine, though not otherwise known in chemistry, was the first to form the conception that water is composed of hydrogen and oxygen, or rather of phlogisticated and dephlogisticated airs (the same things as objects certainly, but somewhat different in and for the mind); and Cavendish, a truly great discoverer of facts in this science, was the first to make the proposition good by unassailable experiments; but this all-important discovery was surely mystified, in the thoughts of both these inventors, by their mistaken adhesion to phlogiston; so that it was the light of Lavoisier's system after all, that gave its significance to that capital fact. Lavoisier did make the discovery for himself, it seems; and certainly he would have made it first, but for the anticipation of Watt and Cavendish: yet the grand distinction of the French law-giver is the circumstance that he was bringing about a reformation, developing a vast system, and exemplifying a new method of inquiry, while our countrymen were the conservative seekers of only particular facts. Such appears to be a righteous judgment regarding the several claims of these three investigators in this matter. Since they represent Scotland, England and France respectively, it is but natural that a good deal should have been written with some acerbity on all the sides of the question. Lord Brougham, Arago, Dumas, have all broken their lances in trying to settle the rival claims, to say nothing of the kindly effort of one of the relatives of Watt. It is not long, indeed, since a deceased critic of our own mingled in the controversy, investigating and adjudicating on its merits, with the skill of an advocate and the love of a friend, if not with all the impersonality of a judge. The question has likewise been handled more recently, and that with much knowledge and rare acumen, in the *Life* of their name-sire sent forth by the Cavendish Society. On the whole, however, while feeling that all such questions of priority are but poor things, we stand by the opinion already pronounced without misgiving, but also

without much concern; for Lavoisier can spare deductions from his estate of fame, which would impair the heritage of either Cavendish or Watt.

As for the air of the atmosphere, the new chemistry found it to be no more an elemental principle of nature than the water of the ocean, but just a mechanical mixture, for the most part, of some 20 parts of oxygen and 80 parts of nitrogen or azote, kept habitually moist by a varying ratio of watery vapour, whether visible or invisible. It also contains some 4 parts in 1000 of carbonic acid gas, to say nothing of those traces of ammonia, carburetted hydrogen (and what not?) more lately discovered in its all-embracing substance. To the earlier Lavoisierian, then, the atmosphere comprised the three gases, hydrogen, oxygen, nitrogen, and the hardest of solid bodies, namely, carbon or the diamond,—the four organogens or main products of the decomposition of organized creatures, plants and animals.

On the other hand the earth, the third of the old elemental quartet, is the resultant of the combinations and mixtures and juxtapositions of some seventeen metals (still to speak from the point of view of chemistry before the discoveries of Humphry Davy, the great consummator of the movement of Lavoisier), of six non-metallic bodies or combustibles (three known, namely, carbon, sulphur, phosphorus; and three inferred to exist, namely, the muriatic, fluoric and boracic radicals, as they were called), of five earths, of two alkalis, and of the three atmospheric gases. But oxygen was the most important of all these provisional elements or undecomposed bodies. It converted the three known combustibles into acids, it was supposed to have converted the three unknown combustible radicals into the corresponding known acids; it converted the metals into bases or so many sorts of earth or alkali, and it was supposed to be the calcifying principle of the regular earths and alkalis; and, in fine, the compounds of oxygen with other elements, whether known or shrewdly inferred, were perceived to be the most abundant and widely spread of all natural combinations:—so that this whole crisis of quick development may well be called the epoch of oxygen and the balance. It was the pneumatic chemistry that prepared the way for it, it was the balance that ushered it on the scene, and oxygen is its great result. The discovery of oxygen rendered the balance both applicable and necessary, the use of the balance put oxygen in its place within the system of nature and of science, and they can never be put asunder in the memory of the chemist. A glass-covered balance, turning on an edge of adamant, with the antique symbol of the mercurial calx in one scale and the

modern representative of mercury + oxygen in the other, is that *Libra* of the historical *Zodiac* into which the sun of Chemistry rose, as soon as the star of Lavoisier was fairly in the ascendant.

§ 2. There is no such creature as phlogiston or the matter of fire. When a body, compound or elementary, is burned, it does not give out imaginary levitative phlogiston: it takes in real gravitative oxygen. Yet Lavoisier, in laying the matter of fire (with its positive levity) to rest for ever, could not escape from its buried power over him. Black had discovered the fact of latent heat, and explained his conception of the phenomenon with the help of the hypothesis of caloric or the matter of heat, a substance, not monstrously endowed with lightness indeed, but possessed of no weight whatever, the very ghost of poor phlogiston! Lavoisier adopted this caloric. When phosphorus burned in vital air with a flame nearly as dazzling as the sun, he knew that it entered with rapidity into chemical union with the oxygen, and he attributed the heat of the flame to the extrication of the imponderable matter of heat or caloric from the phosphorus and especially from the oxygen, to say nothing of the light of the flame in the present connexion. In short, the Empedoclean matter of fire, or rather the Stahlian phlogiston, supposed to have less than no weight, was just broken up into caloric, the matter of heat, and an analogous matter of light, both supposed to be absolutely imponderable projectiles, of a truly material nature, and capable of fixation by certain of the ponderable forms of matter. Founding on a mischievous and purely geometrical abstraction to the effect that extension is the only essential property of matter, Black and Lavoisier admitted into their system the notion of a kind of matter, capable of entering into chemical combination with the indubitable kinds of matter, and yet, not only without visibility or palpability or separability, but absolutely without weight, without the tendency to gravitate towards the central body of the earth, without the power to help the rest of the world to draw towards and move round the sun, in a word, without one of the actual common properties of all the known forms of matter, let the mediæval scholastic or the modern geometer call it an essential property or not! Posterity will assuredly regard this as one of the half-truths or metaphysical mystifications at the core of the Lavoisierian chemistry, as it is well known to be by many now-a-days, notwithstanding that our text-books in this highly positive science are still too full of matters of heat, of light, of electricity, of galvanism, of magnetism, and even of unheard-of odyles or ogres, which the genius of Fact might have been expected to have driven beyond the confines of Science for ever, after the discovery of oxygen and the use of the balance.

§ 3. Oxygen was not only the great agent of combustions (by the extrication of its caloric on its energetic union with the ponderable combustibles), but it was also the principal party to a multitude of more peaceable operations. The respiration of animals, the process of vegetation, and many less important natural phenomena, were all found to depend on this constituent of the atmosphere. It was perceived to be incidental to the growth of organic beings, to their sustenance, and to their decay. What was true then is true still:—oxygen is the main-spring of a vast proportion of all those movements that are constantly going on under the figured face and visible indications of the terrestrial horizon. It is both the builder and the destroyer of the ever-shifting scene around us; at once the finger and the tooth of time.

§ 4. The conception of chemical union received a great, though by no means a full, accession of clearness from the Lavoisierian movement. The word Affinity, standing for the force in virtue of which the chemical combination of two or more bodies takes place, was first used by Barchusen and first defined by Boerhaave. The very word, however, shews that even the latter was under the obsolete notion that it is bodies standing in affinity with one another, that is to say, bodies resembling each other, that are the most prone to enter into mutual union. Mercury was fancied to amalgamate so easily with certain of the metals because it is of a like nature with them. In the new chemistry, however, the strongest and most prevalent compounds were those consisting of the most dissimilar ingredients, for example, those of oxygen and the metals. The term Affinity, therefore, began at once to be equivalent with Chemical Attraction, which also began to be understood as a force acting among the invisible particles of matter, just as gravitation exerts itself among the visible masses of creation:—a thing, the latter, which Newton had seen and said long before the dawn of this, the chemistry of fact. But the Lavoisierians, especially Fourcroy and all who have come after him, went further in this direction than they were (or are yet) warranted by the facts of the science. They inferred, and even explicitly stated, that chemical attraction or particular affinity displays itself only between the particles of different kinds of matter, for instance, between hydrogen and oxygen, but by no means between one particle and another of hydrogen or of oxygen. They defined chemical affinity, indeed, as nothing else than the attraction of cohesion mutually exerted between differing kinds of matter. The particles of a piece of brimstone hold together, in the piece, by the force of the attraction of cohesion, as it is named; and the holding together of mercury and oxygen, in

the mercurial calx, was attributed to the same force acting between the two differing kinds of element, namely, quicksilver and oxygen. Without entering on the discussion of this vital point, we venture to foretell that this will ere long be considered as another error in the very heart of the Lavoisierian chemistry; and it is an error which the Daltonian movement has not yet done away with.

§ 5. The Lavoisierian definition of the elemental nature was perfect. It was the first clear conception ever attained to and uttered on the subject. This great lawgiver of Chemistry became Positive, an apt scholar in scientific scepticism and the admirer of Condillac, defined a chemical element to be nothing more (and nothing less) than a material substance not yet analyzable, not yet broken up into simpler forms; in short, a body not yet decomposed but not therefore indecomposable, to be called simple for the time being but not necessarily always to remain in the list of elements, elementary not in an absolute but only in a logical and provisional sense of the term. The metals, the earths, the alkalis, the combustibles, the three gaseous organogens, were therefore all registered as elements for the meantime. Davy decomposed the alkalis and earths, proving them to be the oxydes of so many new and unheard-of metals. The same chemist, certainly the noblest of the disciples and workmen of Lavoisier, found out the true nature of chlorine, and thereby deprived oxygen of the right to its name; for oxygen had been prematurely chronicled as the acid-gendering element, but chlorine was now discovered to be at once a simple body and an engenderer of acids just as truly as oxygen. Iodine, selenium, silicon, titanium, rhodium and many other substances, equally elementary with oxygen and the old metals, have followed in their turns, and there are now no fewer than some sixty Lavoisierian elements, while there may well be a hundred of them before the century is out. There is no probable limit, in truth, to the number of this species of elementary principle. If the chemist could but dig deeper into the surface of the world he inhabits, or could be licensed to carry his quarrying gear to the moon, or could even lay hold of the smallest of the Junonian asteroids, to say nothing that might be construed into impertinence concerning the diggings of either Jupiter or Venus, what a pile of such simple bodies he might build up! It should never be forgotten that he has hitherto done nothing but scratch the outside of this old Hertha, and that only to the depth of the thickness of this paper-leaf in comparison with a sphere of two feet in diameter. Yes, he has merely raked a little among the outermost ashes of this great globe itself, the hearth of the family of man, and his own body will soon be ashes among ashes, earth

in earth, when the spirit that was in him, returned to God who gave it, may well smile at the remembrance of yon dim spot which men call Earth, and at the century of elements he had gathered from all its little heights and hollows. In fact and in brief, then, there may be six hundred of such elements as ours just as well as sixty; and almost every year is actually adding a new one to the catalogue. In the meantime, it is to be understood that, from not one of these present sixty, can the hottest furnace seven times heated, the coldest freezing mixture, the strongest and steadiest galvanic pile, the most thunderous of electric batteries, or the most pungent reagent, were it even fluorine or potassium at a white heat, extract anything but itself:—gold yields gold, iron yields iron, hydrogen yields hydrogen, only gold and iron and hydrogen, to all the solicitations of the fiercest analytics yet known. ‘We stand before the guarded door of nature: the strong bolts will not move: everything fails us, everything!’

Yet it is hard to think that all those sixty creatures are truly simple or elementary. The instinct of humanity revolts against believing that the Maker has departed from his wonted simplicity of procedure in this one part of creation, and flung such a number of unchangeable elements from his immediate hand. Many thoughtful and ingenuous men, indeed, have frankly supposed that it were more like the nature of the Deity, as shewn by his interpreted works, to pour forth the unreckonable variety of things from the bosom of one or two principles. Thales and the Greek physicists, Ghebiri and the polypharmacists, Roger Bacon and the alchemists, Stahl and the phlogistians, Lavoisier himself, Humphry Davy, Prout, even Berzelius, that man of multitude, have all given more or less explicit expression to this native yearning of the thoughts of the heart of man towards simplicity, that is to say, towards some unity or other underlying the multiplicity of appearances, in this subterranean domain of nature. Man does not love multiplicity; he admires it; but it is unity that he loves, for it moves his imagination while it touches his heart, not only making the whole world kin, but also lessening the distance between that world and God. The next great question in chemistry then, say rather, the perpetual and the greatest question in the science, is precisely this:—What is the interior nature of those elements? From the Lavoisierian point of view, in plain earnest, that is the one question of the age. The science bids us ask, and perhaps nature is ready to answer it: but what shall be done, since no known analytical power can move one of those steadfast natures from its propriety? Let synthesis be tried, if analysis has failed: synthesis has never been tried. Be it observed, too, that

it is in the highest degree probable that all the sixty present elements are equidistant from simplicity: they are all equally compound (and equally simple, for that matter), if there be any truth in the unanimous testimony of chemical analogy. Their case is exactly like that of potassa, soda, lime, baryta, strontia, and their congeners, before the discovery of potassium; that is to say, potassa once discovered to be a metallic calx or oxyde, all the rest were clearly metallic oxydes too, as experiment was not long of shewing. In the same way, if the secret of one of those silent and tantalizing elements be discovered, the secret of them all is out.*

Comte's generalization of the particulars known regarding the growth of man's idea of nature has already been referred to, and it cannot but be interesting to notice the expression of his law in the history of the theory of fire, that impressive phenomenon which continued to be the central point of chemistry until the later Lavoisierians at length put it in its proper and subordinate place. Common combustion, as brought about by energetic oxidation, will always be an important object of study; but, now that other gases are known to support combustion, now that a pair of solid bodies are easily made to extricate heat and light without the presence of any kind of atmosphere, and now that fire is understood to consist in the production of heat and light by or during any chemical action that is intense enough, the venerable process falls to be considered as an accident and not an essence. In one word, the Lavoisierian theory of fire, thus widened by the discoveries that have flowed from it, and stripped of the adhesion of caloric, is an illustration of the third epoch of human thought upon the subject, according to the classification of the French positivist:—it is the plain, unsophisticated, positive statement of the facts of the case, as these present themselves to the senses and the judgment according to sense of the true chemist. The second, the metaphysicizing or fictitious stage of the theory of fire is represented by caloric, still more curiously by phlogiston; and also by the ancient element and empyrean:—abstractions of the mind transformed into things, forbidden creatures, veritable ghosts. And as for the earliest, the religious or superstitious time of knowledge or thought concerning this fiery manifestation of the powers of nature, not only is the mythological story, how Prometheus

* For more particular insight into the first epoch of positive chemistry, the reader is referred backwards to an article on Davy in the third Number of this Review, and forwards to an intended criticism of the Daltonian movement: But the perusal of Lavoisier's *Traité Élémentaire* will do more for him than any later dissertation, especially if followed by the study of Berthollet's *Statique Chimique*.

snatched the element down from a region all on fire* beyond the atmosphere and its thousand stars; an indication of the idolatrous feeling flung around a natural wonder, but the salamander or fire-spirit of the Rosicrucian mystics was a supernatural creation of the theosophic sort, almost belonging to post-medieval Europe. Fire for the altar, strange fire, fire from heaven, and burnt-offerings are the common elements of all the antique worships of the world. Fire has also yielded some of the strongest of the imagery of the sacred books of Christianity. In the end the earth is to be burnt up, the very elements are to melt with fervent heat, the heavens are to pass away like a scroll in the flames; while the horrible nature of sin is set forth by that place where the fire is not quenched: and surely the image of everburning, yet unwasting fire is a symbol more easily turned into ridicule by the frivolous understanding than exhausted by the serious imagination.†

But the true deification of Fire was that of Zoroaster and the Guebres, those worshippers of the Sun. To them the thing was Divine, the peculiar Shekinah of Jehovah, or the supreme manifestation of God among men upon the earth. The less refining multitude did assuredly, by the million and during long ages of time, look upon the sun as very god of very god; on the moon and stars as his heavenly host; and on the seven-brand, the unrestrainable fire, the culinary hearth, and the household lamp as his flaming ministers. It is difficult now-a-days to realize this devotion—in the presence of a chemical product, a combination of caloric and light, a double vibration, a pair of imponderables, or even a couple of dynamides! The fact is that Christendom has at last got into the extreme opposite point of view to all this worship of nature, and the Beautiful One has been degraded into a drudge, 'none so poor to do her reverence.' The Briton of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries actually conceives of the world as an amazingly complicated, yet exquisitely simple piece of mechanism, put together very much as a watch is made by a watchmaker, and left to go according to law, the great Creator withdrawn to some central heaven, thence beholding all its evolutions, and ready to interfere whenever the gracious purposes of his will require a present Deity. Zoroaster, on the other hand, saw nothing but god and only god in nature; he felt as though god shone upon his eye, almost without a veil, in Fire; and he bowed his head in adoration: while his people,

* The word Emypyrean means nothing else, of course, than the Place on Fire.

† To say nothing of Dante and Milton at all in this connexion, if the reader would see how this symbol pierces and informs a Christian poet, let him read the Devil's Dream of Thomas Aird.

as usual, soon confounded the idol with the divinity, the sign with the idea, and became idolaters.

What a thing Fire must have been to the primitive man the first time it flashed upon him! Say that he kept watch over his people; that at the chilliest hour of the night, just before sunrise, he noticed how a dry stick grew warm when rubbed against his club; that he rubbed them again, more stoutly still, and it became hot: at it again, with the wonder of a child and the strength of twenty men, he flung it down for it scorched his hand; yet he could not choose but try again, and it smoked; again and again, quicker and quicker, longer and longer, he pursued the wild experiment until it burst into flame, and the sun arose in the east:—What were the fire upon the brand but the spirit of the blessed sun, come down to dwell with him and his? It is surely not impossible to feel how, in the absence of science, with the presence of only an incalculably small amount of experience, in an intellect far more observative than analytical and a young soul capable of little more than wonder and love, the worship of the Sun and Fire might arise: and, once risen on a national and continental heart, it could never set until the fulness of a better time were come. Nor is Christianity herself, the reconciling genius of the world, ashamed to draw upon the memory of that old faith; for she lifts up her Prince of Peace to the homage of the nations under the image of the Zoroastrian god:—

THE SUN OF RIGHTEOUSNESS WITH HEALING IN HIS BEAMS.

- ART. III.—1. *Storia Civile della Toscana dal 1737 al 1848.* Di ANTONIO ZOB. Tomi 1-3. 8vo. Firenze, 1850, 1851.
2. *Gli Ultimi Rivolgimenti Italiani: Memorie Storiche.* Di F. A. GUALTERIO. Vols. 1-5. Firenze, 1852.
3. *Lo Stato Romano dall'anno 1815 al 1850.* Per LUIGI CARLO FARINI. Volume Terzo. Firenze, 1851.
4. *Florentine History from the earliest Authentic Records to the Accession of Ferdinand the Third, Grand Duke of Tuscany.* By HENRY EDWARD NAPIER, Captain R.N. In 6 vols. London, 1847.
5. *Italy in the Nineteenth Century.* By JAMES WHITESIDE, Q.C., M.P. Fifth Edition, 3 vols. London, 1852.
6. *Memoirs of Scipio di Ricci, late Bishop of Pistoia and Prato, Reformer of Catholicism in Tuscany.* Edited from the Original of M. D. PALTER, by THOMAS ROSCOE. 2. vols. London.
7. *Casa Guidi Windows.* A Poem. By ELIZABETH BARRETT BROWNING. London, 1851.
8. *Religious Liberty in Tuscany in 1851.* London.
9. *Apologia della Vita Politica di F. D. Guerrazzi, Scritta da lui medesimo.* Un volume in 8vo. Firenze, 1851.
10. *First Annual Report of the Society of the Friends of Italy.* London, 1852.

OUTSIDE the San Gallo gate of Florence stands the triumphal arch raised to commemorate the entrance of Francis III., Duke of Lorraine, and of Maria Theresa of Austria, on the evening of the 19th January 1738; into the capital of their new dominions. That arch—a heavy imitation of the arch of Constantine, by an architect of Lorraine—stands as a great landmark in the history of the Tuscan Dukedom. The very sculptures that deform it speak of a new dynasty in old Etruria—the double-headed eagle grasps in its claws both the sceptre and the sword. Giovanni Gastone, the last of the Medici, had been borne to his tomb in San Lorenzo, to that magnificent chapel, the burial-place of his family, where the marvellous figures of Michael Angelo—"the ghosts" of Julian and of Duke Lorenzo—"are sitting on their sepulchres." Decrepit and diseased, the worn out profligate had sunk childless to the grave, and the fairest region of Italy was freed from a race that for three centuries had been "its glory and its shame."

We do not care to dwell on that dark record which constitutes the history of the later Medici, and we have no time to describe Tuscany as it was in the days of that old priest-ridden Cosmo III., whom Addison describes so spicily in his "Travels." We wish rather to speak of Tuscany in later days, and whether

fortunately or unfortunately, we have "no end of books" on such a subject. We have given a sample above, and we think it peculiarly *apropos* that a history like Zobi's, so elaborate, and so thoroughly liberal, should be just now in course of publication. Captain Napier's six heavy Dutch-looking little volumes had by no means exhausted the more valuable materials of "Florentine History," and on the reign of Leopold I. they were peculiarly defective. And we thank Signor Zobi especially for his ample treatment of the great ecclesiastical questions which excited Tuscany seventy years ago, and are now in some degree exciting it again; and for those chapters on the clergy, that read like a tale of the Decameron, even in the pages of a sober historian. Mr. Whiteside's book has at least received the stamp of public approval, as it has reached a fifth edition. Few of our modern writers on Italy have produced a work so readable; and this makes amends for a variety of smaller matters which we are not at all disposed to carp at. We have had occasion to admire at times the happy art with which an intelligent tourist, whose "stay is limited," contrives to work up the loose materials of a few street pamphlets, through which he has spelled his way by aid of dictionary, into a handsome volume, of which, the chances are, the information so liberally communicated by couriers and waiters, and *commissionaires*, aided by the unfailing "Murray," forms the staple. Mr. Whiteside, who very properly does just as he likes in these matters, has evidently picked up some of his details from such "distinguished" and "standard" authorities, and we do not know any one who has made better use of the litter of street pamphlets. A tract of Massimo d'Azeglio, well meriting a place—a history of St. Philomena, by some abbate of marvellous credulity, or of strong faith in the credulity of his readers—and, above all, "The True Story of Beatrice Cenci," condensed from a little nameless volume about as authentic as the "History of the Seven Champions of Christendom," as we strongly suspect Mr. Whiteside knew right well—besides law and literature, manners and morals, and the want of both as a variety. Such a book is just what a traveller needs, neither too heavy nor too trivial or sufficiently comprehensive—

"Quidquid agunt homines nostri, farrago libelli."

Signor Farini's third volume, though perhaps less interesting on the whole than the two which preceded, indicates, we think, decided progress in the art of writing history, and in truth the loose slippery second-rate newspaper style of his earlier volumes afforded considerable room for improvement. It is already known to all who take an interest in Italian matters by the translation of Mr. Gladstone—a book much better than the

original. It is to be regretted that that accomplished translator did not choose instead the far more profound and interesting volumes of the Marquis Gualterio of Orvieto, unquestionably the finest work that has yet appeared on the history of Italy since 1815. It must be admitted the task of translating would have been considerable, as the five volumes already published bring down the history only to 1847; and at this rate, ere the work be completed, there may very possibly be another revolution, and materials in abundance for a few additional volumes as a sequel. Still, were the documents that are appended simply passed over, the mere text of Gualterio would give a far more perfect idea of the great Italian parties to an English reader than any other work we could name: and we do not yet despair of seeing some attempt made to "do" it into our vernacular. Meantime, in addition to sober prose, we have a distillation of Italian politics in poetry, under the attractive though somewhat enigmatical name of "*Casa Guidi Windows*." We have no time to criticise at length a poem so vigorous and so beautiful, and calculated to take so high a place for its own merits, apart from the interest of Italian politics. It is, in short, the poetical apotheosis of Young Italy; and yet that young gentleman is pretty soundly lectured before his canonization. Our object is more sober, and less ambitious: and leaving Mrs. Browning to watch the Arno as it shoots "right through the heart of Florence," we would occupy ourselves in tracing the political history and prospects of Tuscany, as suggested in these and sundry other works, "too tedious to mention." They are of special present interest, seeing that all Tuscany has been excited of late by sundry attempts to abolish her boasted legislation, and especially the laws of the first Leopold.

We shall endeavour to convey an idea, in as few words as possible, of the great outlines of that policy which raised Tuscany to so high a place among civilized nations, and of those laws which for more than a century have been vitally connected with the social and political wellbeing of her people. The Regency that governed Tuscany in the absence of Francis II.* made no progress for years towards the removal of the glaring abuses of the Medicean legislation: even Richcourt and Rucellai feared to provoke too hastily the jealousy of the Court of Rome by any measure that might be construed into resistance of Papal authority, and hence their policy was rather that of defence than that of aggression. The history of the Regency may be summed up in a few words:—a long struggle with the Church, with clamorous monks and refractory bishops, the

* Francis III., Duke of Lorraine, is known as Francis II. of Tuscany, and Francis I. of Austria.

Franzonis of their day, aided and abetted by the Papal Court in their opposition to the very appearance of reform; another co-ordinate struggle with feudal nobles in the Apennines, surrounded with their *bravi* and *banditti*, such as are painted in Manzoni's romance; an ineffectual attempt on the Maremme; a few useful laws, and a step in advance towards the principle of Free Trade, but little real improvement on the condition of the country. The priests were still in the ascendant; the Jesuits were the tutors and schoolmasters in the land of Macchiavel and Galileo; the two universities, Pisa and Siena, languished under a rule that would have made the very sun stand still in obedience to the Canon law; learning had decayed—even painting and sculpture had degenerated; the Della Cruscan Academy alone flourished in all the insupportable pedantry of “word-catchers that lived on syllables.”

And such was the state of matters in 1765, when PETER LEOPOLD, the younger son of Francis I. and of Maria Theresa, ascended the Grand-Ducal throne at the early age of eighteen. The rival claims of Austria and Spain had been adjusted by the marriage of the young prince with the Infanta Maria Louisa, and Tuscany assumed again the position of an independent kingdom. The State was too small to be a gainer by taking any decided part in European contests, and Leopold's first aim was to establish *its strict neutrality*; and this point being so far secured by his relations with Spain and Austria, his efforts were directed, during the twenty-five years of his reign, to the internal improvement of his dominions, so as to make of Tuscany *a model kingdom*. His first great measure indicated the whole course of his future legislation: a year after his accession the harvest having failed, and a famine threatening the land, Leopold at once freed grain, native and foreign, from all commercial restrictions, and inaugurated that principle of Free Trade which he afterwards made the law of the State. Gian Gastone was still wearing out his days in Florence when Sallust Anthony Bandini, a priest of Siena, presented to the ministers of the Grand-Duke his project of Free Trade in Corn as the great remedy for the miserable condition of the Sanese Maremme. The Cobden of those days was considered as either knave or fool—the ministers did not know exactly which—but at all events they could see no earthly connexion between commercial freedom and the draining of the Tuscan marshes. But the Sanese archdeacon was persevering as an Anti-Corn-Law-Leaguer, and not only wrote his “Economical Discourse,” but supported by Pompeo Neri, the ablest Tuscan jurist of his day, he obtained a trial of his principles from Francis II.; and when the first expositor of those days was no longer living to plead them with

his "unadorned eloquence," they were established as a fundamental law of Tuscany, and with such results as to silence all unprejudiced opponents. It was the industry of a free people that tamed the Alps of Switzerland, and reclaimed from the ocean the lands of Holland: the Huguenots of France would have settled in the Maremme after the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, had not the weak and illiberal Cosmo III. prevented them, and driven them elsewhere with their arts and their industry; and Bandini rightly judged, though he dared not speak it plainly to a Medici, that it was not simply from natural causes, but from the effects of long misgovernment, that those wide tracts of country that had contained a large part of the population of old Etruria were now reduced to pestilential marshes. The colonists of Lorraine died in those fatal swamps; of the thousand who had been introduced in the time of the Regency, only thirty-five remained when Leopold began his work of amelioration, and the depopulated region had become still more dreary by being made a place of exile for political offenders. Between death and the Maremme there was but little to choose, and it required all the German perseverance of Leopold to carry on the work of reclaiming; but his new system of leasing the waste lands, and his liberal expenditure of means, produced a marvellous change, though his task was left unfinished; and it was reserved for the second Leopold to acquire still greater glory, according to Giusti's Satire, by draining "the pockets and the marshes" of Tuscany.

To note all the Leopoldine reforms would be to write the history of five and twenty years, during which one measure followed another with a rapidity almost unparalleled in the history of modern legislation. The commerce of Tuscany revived; Leghorn especially made marvellous progress; and if the new policy was injurious to the craft of a few grasping monopolists, it tended to promote "the greatest good of the greatest number." The pernicious system of farming the revenues was abolished; ecclesiastical property (and even the Grand-Ducal patrimony) was subjected to taxation, and the revenue increased; the whole system of finance was revised; the national debt was in great part paid off; a municipal system was established; the old Medicean Consulta abolished; leases, entails, intramural interments were disposed of in succession; and, in fine, in November 1786 was published that Criminal Code which has obtained an European celebrity. The old instruments of torture, the memorials of a bygone legislation, were burned in front of the Bargello. We have neither time nor taste for examining the merits or defects of the Leopoldine Code, as it has been since both tampered with and perverted. It had nothing correspond-

ing to our English Habeas Corpus or Trial by Jury—its moral estimate of crime was in many points defective, and mild to a fault—the entire abolition of capital punishment was a measure more than questionable; and Leopold himself, and afterwards his son, re-established the penalty of death, though not with any very just appreciation of the great law which should guide the legislator in a subject so momentous; but we are ready fully to accord with Forti and Galleatti, that it is “the most generous code that ever issued from the Cabinet of an absolute prince.”

But it is more to our purpose to glance at those ecclesiastical reforms which Leopold, directed chiefly by the Senator Rucellai and the Bishop of Pistoia, carried out so boldly in opposition to the Papal Court. Mr. Whiteside has suggested the propriety of republishing the life of Scipio de Ricci for the benefit of Italy—a measure the expediency of which may be fairly questioned. The value of that remarkable book—remarkable when it was first published—lies very much in the documents which are appended, and the revelations they make of all that was polluting in the conventual life of Pistoia and Prato. It would be like opening to the public the closed chambers of the Museo Borbonico, for the sake of a lecture on moral depravity. And that life itself is one of the clearest proofs that an attempt at reforming Roman Catholicism has but slender chance of success, and that another standard must be lifted up in Italy than the yellow flag of the keys and mitre. The Pope who condemned the Synod of Pistoia was Pius VI.—“that honest Braschi who drained the pontine marshes”—and to come to later times, the few years of the Pontificate of Pius IX. might dissipate for ever the idea that Romish infallibility can deny itself and change; so that even Gioberti himself has entirely given up, in his “*rinnovamento civile*,” his first and favourite theory of Italian regeneration by means of a reforming Papacy. There is one stanza in the “Casa Guidi Windows,” (the twenty-sixth,) which contains more good sense, besides good poetry *gratis*, on the subject of reforming Pontiffs, than some volumes written of late, *ex professo*, on that debated question; and as long as a Pope “must hold by Popes,” and “by Councils from Nicea up,” or rather down, “to Trent”—as long as he must “resent each man’s particular conscience,” and sit “attesting with his pastoral ring and staff,”

“To such a picture of our Lady, hit
Off well by artist angels, though not half
As fair as Giotto would have painted it,”

and as long as he must do a thousand things besides, according to the Canons, we do not expect that either Pius IX. or any future Pius, Gregory or Benedict, will ever sit in the chair of

Hildebrand, "with Andrea Doria's forehead." But this by the way. The life of Scipio de Ricci, very creditably expurgated, is now before the English public, and had the editor condensed it into a single volume, the book would have lost nothing of its value. Besides, in these days of Athenian thirst for novelty, Mr. Roscoe ought to have avoided the appearance of foisting his two octavos on the public as the translation of something new, in fact, "of one of the most popular works of the day." *Davvero!* We were impressed with the conviction that De Rotter's "*Vie de Scipion de Ricci*" had been published in Brussels in 1825, and we remember glancing over the misty volumes with that title, which bore all the appearance of having been thumbed for a quarter of a century. That old book of De Rotter is on the whole a dull and tedious narrative, and all that it contains of value to a modern reader has long since been better told elsewhere. Especially Zobi's chapters on ecclesiastical matters are worth half a dozen volumes like De Rotter's.

Yet Scipio de Ricci merited a biography of some kind. He was a Jansenist, devout and pure in morals as Arnauld or Pascal, though far beneath the intellectual measure of the great Portroyalists; to him more than to any other, Leopold was indebted for those ecclesiastical principles which he wrought into the laws of Tuscany. We enter on this subject more at length, because Leopold II. is now undoing the work of his wiser ancestor, and because Piedmont is fighting the same battle at the present day that was fought in Tuscany in the eighteenth century.

At the period when the Medicean dynasty became extinct, (A. D. 1737,) Tuscany with a population of 890,608, had no less than 27,108 ecclesiastics, (*Zobi*, vol. i. p. 323,) and fully one-third of the whole country was the property of the Church. The land was of course a little monkish Paradise, just like Palermo, as Lord Shrewsbury pictured it forth the other day to the Milesian imagination of Father Fogarty. Popish ideas, however, differ on these points, and it was discovered that the monastic interpretation of certain commandments of the Decalogue was—to say the least—peculiar. Rome threw the shield of her protection over "the holy order of St. Dominick," and the offending names of Prato and Pistoia, whose almost inconceivable immorality had been brought to light by Ricci; but notwithstanding the intrigues of the Holy See, the obnoxious convents were suppressed, and stringent laws were enacted, regulating the mode of admission in future into the monastic orders, and determining the age at which the habit or the veil could be assumed, with other regulations as to dowry, tending to dry up the resources of the recluses. The Mortmain laws of 1751, which the senator Rucellai had introduced during the regency

as the first check to an increase of priestly wealth and power, were still further extended in 1769, and in twelve years the number of the friars was reduced to nearly 2000, and the convents had sunk from 321 to 213. Besides, the regular clergy, with all the conventual establishments, were subjected directly to the authority of the bishops—a measure violently resisted by Rome, for the friars are the great Papal militia for the upholding of the Papal rule throughout Catholic Christendom. The bishops again were chosen by the Government, and the Pope was limited to the simple ceremony of confirming the appointment. It was a thoroughly Erastian proceeding of course, but Rome is a great political organization rather than a Church, and claims the right of interfering, by virtue of its spiritual supremacy, in the civil administration of kingdoms professedly independent. When the Roman Catholic clergy made a violent outcry against the Ecclesiastical Titles Bill introduced by Lord John Russell, they were perfectly well aware that in *every one* of the Catholic kingdoms they had been subjected to laws far more stringent than that mild protest against Papal aggression.

The Papal tribunals claimed the right of publishing bulls, acts, indulgences, and the prohibitory index, without the authority of the Government; and, above all, the bull “*In Cœna Domini*,” with all the “improvements” of Ghislieri, was duly read on Holy Thursday, putting forth the supreme authority of the Pope, by right divine, over the princes and subjects of every Catholic State. These claims were met by the royal right of the Exequatur, which prohibited all such publication without the authority of the civil power. It is marvellous with what unity of purpose the Romish Church has continued for centuries to sustain the power she has usurped, and to contend inch by inch for every vestige of her dominion. The Mortmain laws had been established elsewhere, by the Dukes of Savoy—by the Princes of Este in Modena and Ferrara—by the Republic of Genoa—and, above all, by Venice. Siena, the great Ghibelline city of the Middle Ages, had wisely restricted the acquisition of property by ecclesiastics; but Florence, with her Guelphic sympathies, had allowed the religious orders to encroach till they held “in dead hands” one-third of her possessions. But the Exequatur was embodied even in the Florentine statute of 1415, which contained provisions equivalent to the “*Provisors*” and “*Præmunire*” of our English statute-book: and in the time of Cosmo I., when the decrees of the Council of Trent were published in Tuscany, they were first authorized by the Grand Duke, and confirmed by the authority of the Florentine Senate. —(*Zobi*, vol. ii. p. 84.)

The readers of St. Priest may remember his singularly

graphic description of the visit of the two sons of Maria Theresa — Joseph II. of Austria and Leopold of Tuscany — to the city of the Church, on the death of the old Rezzonico. — (*Fall of the Jesuits*, chap. iii.) There can be little doubt of their influence on the conclave that elected Ganganelli; and, at all events, when the brief was issued that suppressed the Jesuits, (July 21st 1773,) it immediately received the Royal Exequatur in Austria and Tuscany. The Company of Jesus had been introduced into the latter State by Laynez, at the invitation of Eleanor of Toledo, wife of Cosmo I., and had succeeded in establishing their colleges in all the great towns of the Duchy. Lorenzo de Ricci, the general of the Order at the time of the suppression, was himself a Florentine, and a near relative of the reforming Bishop of Pistoia, to whom he bequeathed his silver crucifix: but the rooting out of the formidable society was a part of the plans of Leopold; their colleges were closed and their property confiscated; their “House of Exercises,” in the old fortress of San Miniato, was dismantled, and their few books added to the rich collection of the Magliabecchian Library, and after 220 years they were finally driven out of Tuscany. *The brief of Ganganelli is still the law of the State.* The Jesuits as an order have never been able to obtain admission since, though but lately it was attempted to introduce the Ladies of the Sacred Heart of Jesus, the precursors and outriders (we beg pardon of the Ladies of the Sacred Heart for such a phrase) of the Company of Loyola; and till the laws of Peter Leopold are abolished, they can never legally re-establish themselves in the land where they had signalized both their science and their devotion by the imprisonment of Galileo. The Jesuits at first resisted the Grand-Ducal order, and then had recourse to “pious fraud” in seeking to keep up their society under its new symbol of the Sacred Heart, but at last they were obliged to yield, by either secularizing themselves or going into exile. A few clung to the old walls of their dismantled “Houses,” while others acted with the spirit of real patriots, and

“Left their country for their country's good.”

This measure was followed by the abolition of the right of sanctuary. Leopold had concluded a Concordat with Pius VI. in 1775, but finding that Rome could turn the most seemingly liberal agreement to her own advantage, he resolved in future “to have nothing to do with Concordats,” but to act on his own authority. The sanctuaries were cleared accordingly of the robbers and assassins who had sought the protection of the Church to avoid the penalty of their crimes. The Foro Ecclesiastico, and other privileged courts, were still in existence, but

in 1778 the tribunal of the Nunciature was abolished, and then the tribunal of the Holy Office (in 1782.) Even Republican Florence, though adhering to the great Guelphic party, had resisted the interference of the Popes with her internal administration, and it was only in 1560 that for the first time a Papal Nuncio held court within her walls. But the Inquisition—and it is well to recall it in these days of re-action—had a prescriptive right of more than 500 years; for, more than five centuries ago, there were adherents of “the pure gospel” in the fair city. The Paulicians or Paterini had a numerous party, but Dominick of Guzman had just headed an exterminating crusade against the Albigenses on the plains of Languedoc, and the dog with the blazing torch—the chosen and appropriate emblem of St. Dominick—ere long lighted his fires in Italy. Fra Pietro of Verona, better known in the annals of his order as Pietro Martire, roused the Florentines against the unoffending Paulicians, and the result was not so much a civil war as a massacre. In the Via Guicciardini, opposite the Church of Laura Felicità, on the spot where one of these extraordinary battles was fought against the Paterini, stands a column surmounted by the statue of the terrible Dominican. The knife in his hand marks him out at once as “St. Peter Martyr,” though few perhaps of our English tourists, and fewer still of the occupants of the “Via Guicciardini,” have ever inquired why that statue was erected to the Grand Inquisitor. A few glaring cases of persecution gave Leopold the fitting opportunity of closing the ecclesiastical prisons and burning publicly the instruments of torture. There are, unfortunately, too many ways of making up for the loss of that Spanish enginery, but except in Rome, doomed to all that is exceptional, the Inquisition *in the old form* exists nowhere in Italy. The abolition of the Foro Ecclesiastico, and the subjection of the clergy to the civil law in common with other members of the State, and a few other measures of lesser importance, completed the defence which Leopold was so long constructing against Papal encroachment. The Siccardi laws in Piedmont, and the clerical censures on Santa Rosa, may give some idea of the value which Rome attaches to the Foro Ecclesiastico.

The internal reforms of the Church which Ricci carried out in his own diocese, and which Leopold resolved to introduce generally, were of too short duration to produce any very marked effect on the clergy or the people. Holding the opinions of the Jansenists, or at least the four points of the Gallican Church, Ricci denied of course the Papal infallibility, and maintained the right of bishops to hold synods in their own dioceses. He styled himself, in his pastoral letter convoking the famous synod of Pistoia (1786), “bishop by the grace of God,” omitting the

usual *addendum* "and of the Holy See:" he treated the Limbo of infants as "a Pelagian fable," and Indulgences as a superstition: he advocated the use of only one altar in the church, the celebration of mass in the vulgar tongue, and the unveiling of images that were superstitiously venerated. These reforms, and the rigid discipline exercised on the friars, whose conduct was far from being edifying, excited the whole country against the "heretic" bishop. The synod of Pistoia was eminently successful, but the council of Florence, convoked the year following, came to quite an opposite conclusion on the "fifty-seven points," which Leopold, with the minuteness of a Sacristan, had submitted for discussion. A riot was excited in Prato, in Ricci's own diocese, against the innovations, the ostensible object of the uproar being to protect the altar of the cintola, or girdle of the Virgin Mary. The "riot of the Madonnas" was only part of a great scheme, and the unfortunate bishop was obliged to seek refuge elsewhere. For a time he was protected by the Grand Duke, but when Leopold assumed the purple of the Cæsars, on the death of the Emperor Joseph in 1790, the reaction could no longer be controlled. The demolished altars were rebuilt, the images veiled again, the companies re-established, the synod of Pistoia was condemned by the Pope, the bishop weakly recanted, though, like Galileo, he did not change his mind, and after years of persecution, and even imprisonment, "the Reformer of Catholicism in Tuscany" died broken-hearted at his villa of Rignano.

The work of Peter Leopold thus remained unfinished, "like the Florence churches," and hence the partial success of his system. It is true the times were unpropitious, and the people opposed to the "*berlicche berlocche*" of their philosophic ruler. His own agents at times, and we might say very generally, favoured in secret the public disaffection. The only sincere reformer in the council of Regency, appointed on his removal to Vienna, was the senator Francesco Gianni, who in a few months was obliged to seek refuge, like Ricci, from the popular violence. Pompeo Neri, the jurist Rucellai, the auditor and authority on all ecclesiastical questions, and Angelo Tavanti, his oracle on finance, had all died before Leopold's removal. The Jesuit Summating, Leopold's confessor—for with strange inconsistency he chose a confessor from the society he had suppressed—was a principal agent in the reaction, especially in all matters connected with the Church. But besides, the whole system of Leopoldine reform, admirable as it was, and far in advance of anything that modern Italy had yet obtained, had been forced despotically on an unprepared and reluctant people; and when the directing hand had ceased to guide it, it stopped at once. The people had

not risen to the mark of the legislator, and the laws had descended from the elevation of a philosophic despotism, instead of springing spontaneously from the advancing civilisation of a nation. Leopold had given no constitution, and had not always filled up the void made by his abolition of the laws of his Medicean predecessors. It is true he had a constitution *in petto*—a kind of Scotch Presbyterian regime for the government of the States by municipal councils, provincial councils, and a general assembly meeting annually, with the Grand-Duke for moderator. But that constitution “imagined by Peter Leopold” was never granted, and even Gianni’s memoir, which has preserved the outline, was not published till long after the death of the prince. This singular memoir, written in 1805, remained as a dreary remembrance of an opportunity that had been allowed to pass, and as a protest against a return to the old Sanfedism.

The first years of FERDINAND III. were unpropitious. France was beginning to heave to the earthquake; and Italian princes felt the ground beneath them trembling. For fifteen years Ferdinand was an exile, and Florence had her courts of Bourbons and of French. Old Forsyth remarked in his day that the French occupation was the great epoch from which everything was reckoned—“*avanti i Francesi*”—“*nei tempi dei Francesi*”—“*dopo i Francesi.*” The French have certainly the merit of inaugurating a new era in Italy. The new impulse given to education and science, the great public works undertaken, the French system of taxation, the Code Napoleon, the suppression of convents, and the new regulation of the Church, were far in advance of the old miserable compound of priestcraft and despotism that constituted Italian government. Fossombroni presented to Napoleon a memoir in behalf of Tuscany, such as no other estate of the Peninsula could have presented, but for a time all Italy was constrained to succumb to “*les idées Napoléoniennes.*” The French rule has left one or two traces on the Tuscan statute-book; but in the Restoration of 1805, though there were imperialists and liberals, the Leopoldine party prevailed, and Ferdinand III. preserved, though not in its integrity, the system of his father; and again when Leopold II., “now happily reigning,” as the Court Almanac says, succeeded in 1824, he began his reign with an eulogy of his “immortal grandfather.” And, first of all, the praise of preserving the traditional policy of the house of Lorraine, in the Grand-Ducal States, is due to the great Tuscan statesman of the day—that Victor Fossombroni whose monument, a masterpiece of Bartolini, stands in Santa Croce among the tombs of the great Florentines; but a new liberalism was springing up in the universities, and among the more enlightened classes of the community, which required

something more than a system stereotyped for nearly half a century; and among the higher ranks of the citizens there were men who advocated *progress*, that the government might keep pace with the growing civilisation of the country.

It would be unfair to measure the aristocratic liberals of Tuscany, such as the Marquis Gino Capponi, or Cosimo Ridolfi, with our English Whigs, or with the conservative Statesmen of a country that has had its parliament for centuries. Florence, first of all, and afterwards Tuscany, had been jealous of their national independence; but the citizens had scarcely ever enjoyed a fair measure of civil liberty, and even Fossombroni who defended the first so manfully, but very imperfectly comprehended the second. The whole habits of a people cannot be new-modelled in a day, and we do the constitutional party in Italy injustice when we test their measures by the perfection of that slow growth of centuries which is the glory of our British civilisation. And then we must take into account the element of the Papacy from which the Reformation happily delivered us. We were ready enough to sing "Io Pean," when Mazzini gave law from the Capitol, instead of the Pope from the Vatican, and certainly so far the change was for the better; but the slow work of rooting out the deeply seated superstition of a Romanized population had still to begin. It was no great change on the mere materialism of worship when the Bambino of the Ara Coeli, the little miraculous wooden doctor of the Franciscans of the Capitol, made his rounds in the triumphal chariot of Leo XII., and the devout Romans of the republic of 1849, shouted, "Viva il Bambino democratico!" or when Guerrazzi taught his applauding Livornesi that Christ was the highest model of a democrat. Standing between despotism on the one hand, and popular superstition or wild extravagance on the other, the Italian Liberals of the moderate party, like Count Balbo and Massimo d'Azeglio in Piedmont, or Gino Capponi in Tuscany, had no easy position, to maintain against the two extremes; and though we believe that *their* system will never accomplish the moral regeneration of Italy, till it has reached a higher point than their party has yet aimed at, we would not on that account let loose the tide of French democracy, or inundate the Peninsula with the gospel of Lamennais.

But side by side with the moderate reformers rose the young Liberals of the universities, Guerrazzi, Salvagnoli, and Forti of Pescia, impatient of the slow and timid movements of the elders of their party. With these were associated the like-minded of the other states, such as Tommaseo, Leopardi, and Pietro Giordani, who had sought the freer atmosphere of Tuscany, or had been driven to seek it by the iron rule that prevailed else-

where. The "Autologia" of Florence was their "Edinburgh Review," giving utterance as boldly as it dared to the new ideas, till the Government most imprudently silenced the ablest scientific and literary journal of Italy. Besides these, Tuscany had its poetic Liberalism, the grand dramas of Niccolini, and the exquisite satires of Giusti. But the man who was destined to occupy the most prominent position was F. D. Guerrazzi, whose trial for high treason is now attracting so large a share of public attention in the Peninsula. The history of that Leghorn lawyer has been written in part at least by himself, and that little volume of "Memorie" addressed to Mazzini in 1849, notwithstanding its ridiculous pomposity, we think most valuable for its picture of the Italian democrat; we should like to dwell on that curious autobiography, tracing the gradual development of the "greater part of the family of mortal sins" in the character of the hopeful youth, till he became a student of Pisa, and saw Lord Byron, and read his poetry, for this makes one great epoch in the history. The wandering "Childe Harold" was then in Pisa—in popular estimation a spirit of evil in human form on some dark and mysterious errand to the children of men—but in the eyes of the wondering student, the very Apollo of the Vatican. Byron henceforth became "his master and his model." Banished for a time from the university for too keen an appetite for politics, and in after life closely watched by the police as a restless conspirator brooding dark schemes and plotting nobody knew what—dodged by the *gens d'armes*, for the paternal government *temporibus illis* kept a keen look out upon its subjects, and most kindly wished "every man quiet and peaceful with a wife and at least four children"—imprisoned once or twice on mere suspicion, and liberated again without knowing why or wherefore—and then banished again to Portoferraio, where he planned his romance on the Siege of Florence. Guerrazzi, in short, had laid up "capital" to be turned to account when opportunity should offer. His romance especially was a fierce defiance of the powers that were in those days; he "wrote a book because he could not fight a battle," and here is his picture of his own romance,—

"I thought it charity to ply all the torments used by the ancient tyrants and by the holy office, and to invent others still more atrocious to excite the sensibility of this land fallen into miserable lethargy; I wounded it and poured into the wounds brimstone and burning pitch; I galvanized it, and God only knows the trembling anxiety with which I saw it open its closed eyes and move its livid lips. . . .

* This monthly review appeared first in 1821, and ceased in 1832. Among the contributors, besides those named above, were Ridolfi, Capponi, Inghirami, and Romagnosi.

I chose the part of Prometheus and wished to animate the statue, even though the vulture shall prey upon my vitals for ever.”—(*Memorie*, pp. 94, 95.)

A taste for the tremendous—*le gout des émotions*—was sure to be gratified by that patriotic romance, and even the Queen Mab could hardly match the wild profanity of those which preceded or followed. A whirlwind to move the waters of the Lake Asphaltites—a blessing or a curse from heaven, it mattered little which, if Italy should live—and if not,—

“Exoriare aliquis nostris ex ossibus ultor !”

Such were the grand ideas of that school of Romanticism by which a new era was to be brought in. And are these the men who are to dry the tears of the Niobe of nations? Are these the prophets of the future? To the credit of Mazzini we do not hold *him* accountable for the wild excesses of his party: there is a sublimity in his faith in the destinies of Italy that raises him above the mere reverses or successes of the moment—a poetry, a sentimentalism that refine and elevate the prophet of the “Republic one and indivisible”—an earnestness and devotion in his Pantheistic creed that set him far apart from the grosser materialists. But let the truth be freely told of all, and certainly the extremes in the Italian struggle were Despotism and Priestcraft on the one hand, with Democracy and Pantheism on the other.

We do not set forth Guerrazzi as a type of the Tuscan Liberal, though his book procured him such incredible popularity, that Gualterio speaks of it as marking an epoch in the history of the revolutionary movement. (*Rivolgimenti*, vol. ii. p. 52.) In fact Guerrazzi partakes more of the nature of the Sicilian or the Corsican* than of the refined and gentle Tuscan. The national character in the land of painting and of song has been softened down almost to effeminacy, and is sadly wanting in vigour and independence. In the Florentine, acute, polished, and graceful—true son of “la gentile Firenze”—the heroism of the old Republican has died away. He can raise a cenotaph to Dante, but “Dante sleeps afar” beside the pine trees of Ravenna, and his native city wants even the ashes of the stern old Ghibelline. That single city—the judgment is Mariotti’s—has

* We give as an illustration the epitaph to his father’s memory which Guerrazzi inscribed on the tablet under the portico of the church at Montenero :—

Hic intus
Francisci Guerratii
insontes cineres
Expectant postremum Dei judicium
Sine pavore.

His father he describes as a man of no religious profession.

given birth to more great men than all the rest of the peninsula, but the tombs of Santa Croce are a poor defence against the brute force of the Austrian.

The "paternal Government" of LEOPOLD II., guided by Fos-sombroni, and afterwards by Don Neri Corsini, was occupied at first with the material improvement of the State. Infant schools, normal schools, the education of the deaf and dumb, savings banks, and the draining of the Maremme, were quite enough for a ministerial programme. Education was the mania, and it is but fair to mention Raphael Lambruschini, nephew of the old illiberal Cardinal, as foremost in the work. Reforms of law and railways came later, but for a time Tuscany was turned into a kind of large academy. A grand *festa*, the meeting of the scientific congress at Pisa, the inauguration of a statue to Galileo, a magnificent discourse from Rosini, and a thousand other things, and Tuscany was quiet under her mild absolutism. The affairs of Rimini disturbed the frontiers a little in 1845, but "the manifesto of Rimini" was corrected and modified at Pisa, in the rooms of Montanelli, a professor of the university, and Renzi was allowed to pass through Tuscany when flying from the *sbirri* of old Pope Gregory. It is true when the Grand-Duke visited Rome in 1841, Gregory XVI. extorted some kind of promise that he would repeal at least some of the Leopoldine laws; but the minister, Don Neri Corsini, refused to sign any act that would mar the work of Peter Leopold, or change the traditional policy of the Palazzo Vecchio; and the Pope, in his allocution read in the next consistory of Cardinals, made bitter reference to the disappointment of his hopes, and to the slippery Grand-Ducal faith:—" *Sed celsissimus ille Dux quae nobis promisit non tenuit!*" (*Gualterio*, ii. 71.) Such promises were considered "more honoured in the breach than the observance;" and in those days Massimo d'Azeglio printed in Florence his fearful exposure of the Papal Government. But on the death of Don Neri Corsini, in 1845, when the Paver and Baldasseroni ministry came into power, a policy of approximation to Rome and Austria began. Even in 1846, when Rome suddenly became liberal, Tuscany was retrograding, and the Government seemed to have passed into the hands of the police at the Palazzo Non-Finito. The elements of a revolution were gathering on every side, but Leopold II. was blissfully unconscious: "il n'avait rien su, rien vu, rien prévu." It was not, however, the time precisely for concentrating all power in the person of the Grand-Duke. The enlightened Liberals of Florence—the Baron Ricasoli, the Marquis Gino Capponi, Cosimo Ridolfi, the advocate Salvagnoli, and others, had the courage to warn the Government of the impossibility of turning back the spirit of an

enlightened age to the theories of the later Medici. In Pisa, Montanelli, mild, dreamy, and fantastic, now Mazzinian and democratic, and again Giobertian and theocratic, changing with every new idea that roused his fancy, was exercising a paramount influence on the youth of the University, and Guerrazzi was supreme in Leghorn. There was no liberty of association, of speech, of the press, and it was only by papers clandestinely printed that the wants and demands of the people were made known. And these demands of the Tuscan Liberals were eminently moderate; the leaders of the movement in Florence were men of the highest education and character; the Pisan professor was of too pliant material to be much dreaded—wood perhaps for the manufacture of a Mercury, but certainly not the block out of which to carve a Brutus. The Government at last gave way,* and granted Liberty of the Press, (May 1847.)

We have no intention of telling over again the old story of the Revolution. It was the same thing everywhere—the press, the civic guard, a constitution, Custoza, Novara, and the reaction. But two matters are important at present—the political career of that remarkable man whose trial in the Florence courts is now exciting an almost exclusive attention in Italy, and the claims of Tuscany generally on the gratitude and good faith of the Grand-Duke. After one or two liberal measures in 1847, the Marquis Cosimo Ridolfi became minister, and Tuscany kept pace in reform with the best of Italy. A constitution was solemnly granted in Feb. 15, 1848; then came the war and the cabinet of Gino Capponi. The Pisan students, with Montanelli at their head, had fought valiantly at Curtatone, where Montanelli had been wounded, and borne as a prisoner to the citadel of Mantua. The news of his death had been spread at home, and funeral honours decreed him, but having returned afterwards by an exchange of prisoners, his popularity was unbounded. But the Mazzinian agitation had begun, “the war of kings had ended,” and Italy must henceforth trust to “the war of the people.” A certain democratic orator, wonderfully gifted in his way—Padre Gavazzi may perhaps remember the name—reached Leghorn, declaimed, and was arrested; an uproar followed, and,

* Gualterio has devoted a whole chapter to Mr. Cobden's visit to Italy at this time. In Tuscany, the native ground of the Free Trade principles, the Academy of the Georgofili inscribed his name on their Album, where the name of Sir Robert Peel had been inscribed before. The ministers Paver and Baldasseroni took part in the public homage to the Free Trade agitator. When Cobden rose to give thanks for this honour, he certainly touched a point peculiarly suitable to the time:—“We succeeded,” he said, “because a great minister had comprehended the duty of changing his opinion, and what is more honourable for him, had the courage to confess it.” The eyes of the academicians were turned to Paver and Baldasseroni. (*Gualterio*, vol. v. p. 446.)

finally, in September, the insurrection of Leghorn. To quiet the insurgent city Montanelli was appointed governor, and managed his affairs so well that in a month he had ousted the ministry, and, in company with Guerrazzi, was in the cabinet at Florence, with war and the constituent for his programme. The "Apostolic Pilgrim" of Gaeta, however, anathematized the constituent, and the poor Grand-Duke, filled with spiritual terrors, consulted the Pope on his new position. The answer may be easily imagined, and the Grand-Duke himself, attached to the old paternal absolutism, had never liked the new ideas, and, following the pontifical example, fled to Gaeta.

The ministry resigned, and the scene that followed was a stirring one. In the Piazza of the old Florentine Signory—the scene of so many a drama, under the Loggia of Orgagna, where the priors of the Republic had given way to the hired guards of the Medici, and where the Perseus of Cellini still stands sword in hand, holding up the head of the Medusa—the Circoli held their noisy meeting to decide on the affairs of State. They elected a Provisional Government, and appointed Guerrazzi, Montanelli and Mazzini ministers. We dare say the scene was quite as fine as any old Guelphic or Ghibelline triumph in the annals of Florence, but it lacks the halo of antiquity to make it imposing. Caesar Augustus, in a fashionable Parisian costume, or Dante dressed *à la mode*, would be sadly reduced in our imagination. We suppose, judged by the standard of our modern civilisation, even the godlike kings who fought at Troy would be about on a par with as many chiefs of American Indians fighting for a handsome squaw. Had the thing happened in our days, it would have been settled diplomatically by a *chargé d'affaires*; even Lord Palmerston would not have thought it necessary to send round the Channel fleet to the mouth of the Scamander, to put an end to a quarrel so disreputable, and the whole *matériel* of Homer's deathless Epic would have been condensed into a column of the *Times*. It is a comfort to think that these modern scenes will become grander as they get older.

The triumvirate—the Republic proclaimed at Leghorn—the decisive defeat at Novara—Guerrazzi dictator, and Montanelli sent to Paris—a dispute with Mazzini on the *unification* or fusion of Tuscany with Rome—a counter revolution in favour of the Grand-Duke—Guerrazzi in opposition, and at last sulkily giving in—the Grand-Duke retalled, and Guerrazzi imprisoned—Leghorn bombarded by the Austrians—the Grand-Duke's return in the uniform of an Austrian general—the reaction, imprisonments, and a trial *three years after*—such is the modern history of Tuscany.

But there are matters of more importance connected with this

reaction than the trial of Guerrazzi and his associates, and which demand the attention of the European governments.

And *first* of these is the threatened absorption of Tuscany into the Austrian empire. It would be tedious to follow the persevering attempts of Austria to make Tuscany a mere fief of the empire, or to appeal to the long list of treaties that establish its independence, from the Quadruple Alliance of 1718 down to the Treaty of Vienna in 1815, for the diplomacy of the Tuscan succession would fill a volume. But especially since the rival claims of Austria and Spain were adjusted by the treaties of 1765, (for we do not speak of the cession of Lorraine to France,) the preserving of the distinct independence of Tuscany, and its separation from Austria, has been the unvarying policy of the younger or Italian branch of the house of Hapsburg-Lorraine. Leopold I. maintained it firmly against the emperor Joseph, and when he himself was Kaiser, he adhered most scrupulously to his former policy. After the general overturn of the continental governments, and in the re-organization of 1815, Tuscany was fortunate in having such men as Fossombroni and Don Neri Corsini to defend its ancient rights "against all deadly;" and if treaties are of any value, the 100th article of the Treaty of Vienna put the independence of Tuscany under the safeguard of the great powers of Europe. Yet even this did not prevent new attempts of the Imperial Cabinet on the autonomy of the weaker State, and especially in 1824, on the death of Ferdinand III., the Austrian minister at Florence was directed to concert with the heir of the Crown the terms of the proclamation announcing his accession, and thus, to maintain the appearance of feudal rights in the Grand-Duchy, Count Bombelles went accordingly to the Arch-Duke Leopold, but was received instead by Fossombroni, *as minister of the new sovereign*. The ambassador, disconcerted by this reception, announced that he was sent to *the Arch-Duke Leopold*, but Fossombroni replied that he was authorized by *His Imperial and Royal Highness the Grand-Duke Leopold II.*, to receive any communication made to him as Secretary of State. The Austrian diplomatist was *not* in fact received by the heir of the Crown, and the next morning, the same proclamation that announced the death of Ferdinand, announced also the accession of Leopold II.

Since the restoration of 1849, in direct opposition to the policy of a century, and to the spirit, at least, of the general law of Europe, as established by the Treaty of Vienna, Tuscany has been a garrison of Austrian troops. Let it be remembered that the forcing of the *constituent* on a Constitutional Sovereign was the work of a noisy minority—that the democratic ministry and the dictatorship fell in less than six months after their formation,

and that the Grand Duke was recalled by the acclamation of the people: and on what plea was that convention between the cabinets of Florence and Vienna for the occupation of Tuscany by Austrian troops signed in the April of 1850? The Tuscan Court would perhaps have preferred a restoration by force to the spontaneous movement of the people: certainly Rome and Naples would have considered it more *à la mode*: but when Leghorn had yielded to the troops of Baron d'Aspre, and the overwhelming majority of the Tuscans desired to settle down under the constitutional regime, on what plea is a land professedly independent still trodden down by the feet of the Austrian soldiery? Is the spirit of the treaties of 1815 to be violated, that Austria may sit like an incubus on the Italian peninsula, and that the heir of the "Holy Roman Empire" may not only abolish the wise and tolerant laws of the Emperor Joseph in the Empire itself, but also enable the scarlet despotism of the seven hills to remove the ancient landmarks which the legislature had set up in Italy itself against its exorbitant pretensions. Austria is thus consolidating her power in unfortunate Italy, and everywhere in favour of despotism and priestcraft: and the only plea that can be urged is this, that the restored governments of 1849 have become *so intolerable* that they cannot exist without the protection of the Austrian bayonets. England cannot look on carelessly, and that commercial treaty which the Cabinet of Vienna (if the rumour be true) is attempting to force on prostrate Tuscany, may yet teach her that her own interests are concerned in demanding that the Austrian troops should be withdrawn from a kingdom which the general law of Europe has recognised as independent. Something has been already done in this way when the able diplomatist now at Florence retrieved the singularly mismanaged Mather business, but *that* was a slight matter to the English interests that will be involved, if Tuscany be virtually absorbed by Austria.

Again, the whole Leopoldine legislation is in danger of being overthrown, and civilized Tuscany reduced to the model of Naples and the Pontifical States. We shall not waste time in noticing the miserable intrigues of the agents of the Papal Camerilla to induce the weak and superstitious Leopold II. to undo the whole work of the former princes of his house. We have sketched as fully as our space would permit the Leopoldine system under which Tuscany had prospered for a century: but we may allude again to its three great principles according to the definition of the Tuscan jurists. 1st, Laicity of the State, *i.e.*, its independence of Papal control. 2d, Equality of all in face of the law; and, 3d, Economic liberty. Or let us state these principles more fully, so as to convey an adequate idea of

a system that is connected with the whole civil life of the people, that comes home to their bosoms and business, and touches their interests every hour. The neutrality and distinct political independence of the State: liberty of conscience: civil emancipation of the Jews, and subjects not Catholic: a mild criminal code with public trial of the accused: equality of taxation, and the abolition of municipal immunities: the nomination of bishops by the State, and the Exequatur as a defence against Romish aggression: the suppression of the *Foro Ecclesiastico*, of the Inquisition, and of the Jesuits: the mortmain laws and abolition of entails: the regulation of conventual discipline: municipal liberties, and a constitution "looming in the future." Such is the system that in the middle of the nineteenth century, and in a kingdom civilized beyond any in Italy, is in danger of being abolished that Tuscany may swarm with monks and friars as in the palmy days of Cosmo de Medici.

It is right to state that the agents in these intrigues are Luchese. That little Duchy of Lucca, incorporated with Tuscany in 1847 on the death of Maria Louisa of Parma, had not partaken of the Leopoldine reforms; and has now furnished agents, of whose character the less we say the better, to do the work of the not very scrupulous Court of Rome. The abolition of the laws emancipating the Jews, entire priestly control in the matter of education, and the free action of the Church according to the old regime, were the first matters proposed: and even at present the Jewish liberties *have* been curtailed by the abolition of the constitution; schools and teachers *have* been entirely subjected to the control of the clergy by the late law on education, and by the concordat of April 1851, the Church has made the first grand step towards resuming all its former privileges. The Concordat was professedly a mere instalment, and yet it establishes the complete freedom of the clergy in their ministry, and the publications relating thereto, and in their communications with the Holy See. Bishops were left at full liberty henceforth to commit the Lent preachings and missions generally to whomsoever they pleased; and, besides, the censorship of books treating *ex professo* of religious matters, and the authority of prohibiting to the faithful the reading of any book whatsoever, were committed to the four Archbishops of Florence, Pisa, Lucca, and Siena, the sixteen bishops, and their enlightened, liberal, and tolerant clergy. The subject of marriage belonged of course to the canon law. And the fifteen articles of this Concordat of the 25th of April were agreed on and signed by Cardinal Antonelli, and the minister Baldasseroni, at the very time when Piedmont, having passed the Siccardi Laws, was preparing to erect the very bulwarks that

Tuscany had thrown down.* The first great step then has already been made towards the abolition of the whole system of Peter Leopold: the ultimate aim, from which the Papal Court has never for one moment deviated since the days of Pius VI., being to re-establish the old mortmains, the ecclesiastical immunities, the Inquisition, and the Jesuits! A comprehensive programme this for 1852! To the honour even of the Baldasseroni and Lauducci ministry, be it said; that they have hitherto resisted these last proposals, and the Lucchese agent of the Papacy has been dismissed for the time from the Cabinet; but unless the representatives of such great powers as are still free interfere to protect the sacred rights of a whole people, or another revolution shake the central seat of continental despotism, Tuscany is now too feeble to defend the laws to which her sovereign was sworn.

The *third* point which we notice is the entire abolition of the constitution of February 15th, 1848. It is needless now to appeal to the oath of the Prince, or to the solemn promise given verbally by Leopold II. to the Tuscan deputies at Gaeta, and afterwards repeated in the proclamation of the 1st of May 1849, to preserve and to develop the constitutional regime he had instituted. The great example of political immorality had been already given by Pius IX. Austria, too, has set aside without compunction the constitution of the 4th of March, and, unfortunately, examples are but too abundant; and yet we are justified in citing the case of Tuscany as the most glaring. We exclude France, of course, which as becomes an original, independent, and free-thinking nation, never condescends to follow any stereotyped course or ecclesiastical canon for making oaths and breaking them. In Italy, however, there is a plain, ordinary, Macadamized road, by which reactionary princes invariably travel. But let it be remembered that what Tuscany sought was not Democracy, (we except the few now under process, and their adherents,) but constitutional government. The Medici themselves had not abolished the old "Council of Two Hundred," and "Senate of Forty," which represented the popular element; and the first Leopold, had the times been propitious, would have extended that representation to the whole State. Before the reforms of 1848, during a hundred and ten years, the Austrian Grand-Dukes and the French had introduced and promoted a new civilisation, and it cannot be said of the Tuscan people that they are now unfit for constitutional government. They are educated and intelligent, temperate and moderate: they have been accustomed to municipal forms, and they have a history and traditions of greatness, and a name imperishable in the annals of Italy; and with all these claims, their cities must

be guarded by foreign soldiers who cannot speak their language, and their every movement watched by spies and the police. That system of spies and informers, above all, tends to corrupt and demoralize, and by none of the Italian dynasties has it been plied more perseveringly than by the princes of Lorraine. Even Leopold I. spent enormous sums on spies; it was a taste of his family, and his Austrian mother kept spies on him; and it is notorious that Leopold II., who keeps his subjects under such infamous *surveillance*, is himself watched on behalf of Austria. There is no free press—no liberty of speech—suspicion and distrust prevail; and cases are but too well known in which the priest has divulged the secret of the confessional, the wife “informed” upon her husband, and the father on his child. And through the ever-watchful police, imprisonments take place, and cases are gravely tried on the most ridiculous pretences. We shall merely cite one such case. A confectioner of Siena had prepared in the materials of his “calling” a figure of Italy, and adorned it with the three national colours—a fine thing for children to look at in the cook-shop window! The confectioner was cited before the tribunals, and “the great gingerbread case” became famous among the lawyers of Siena. There was no law, however, on the statute-book that made a parti-coloured cake offensive to the Grand-Duke, “his crown and dignity;” and the confectioner, triumphantly acquitted, was allowed henceforth to work out his politics in pastry.

We know not in what terms to describe the infatuation with which Leopold II. seems to be hastening on in the destruction of all that was noble in his dominions. The trade of Leghorn has been sacrificed to a league with Rome, and when commerce has diminished the Government begins to enlarge the port. The Universities of Pisa and Siena have been sacrificed also—their chairs suppressed, that money may be saved to pay the Austrians. One journal still free protested indignantly against such vandalism, and was suspended, and finally suppressed. But unhappily this is not the worst. It is not our purpose here to speak of those religious persecutions for which in these late days Tuscany has been distinguished: yet let us state the great leading facts in reference to the origin at least of such persecutions. The reforms of Leopold I. and of Scipio de Ricci were in advance of their age, and yet they were by no means unproductive. The Church of Rome was kept in check, and education of a more large and liberal kind, as it supplanted the miserable priestly tutorship, not only destroyed in the minds of the people the absurd superstitions against which Ricci strove in vain, but also led them on in the search for truth. And that educational movement of which Raphael Lambruschini was the head, could

not fail to prepare the way for something more than its promoters had dreamed of at the first. The Bible, the great enlightener, made its way into Tuscany; and many years ago, a few Florentines, and among them Count Piero Guicciardini, forsook the Papal system for simple belief in the Word of God. It was no question of churches or church government with these few earnest men; it was not even a question of Protestantism or Popery, but simply of Bible teaching—"What saith the Lord?" And hence their unwillingness to give any merely negative character to their creed, and their prejudice, very natural in Italy, though somewhat unreasonable, against the name of "Protestant." The first year of revolution was a time of feverish political excitement, when the masses were too much occupied with the stirring events of the day to have much time left for calm and sober and earnest study of religious truth. But at that brief season of unbounded liberty, or of anarchy, the Bible spread over all Italy; it was printed in Florence, and in Rome itself. But after Novara the reaction came with its atrocities, and the voice of the "Holy Father" who had blessed the banners of the Italian armies, was lifted up in anathema against that very movement to which he himself had given the first impulse. Pius IX. regained his throne, but lost all moral power in Italy. A system of which he was the head and chief could scarcely be infallible. The Bible was opened and studied earnestly; and the result, especially in Florence, has been the entire abandonment of Roman Catholicism by hundreds of the population. The law documents before us, to go no further, attest it as a notorious fact that the principles of Protestantism, or of the Bible, have spread almost in every town of Tuscany. An attempt was made to crush this rising spirit of inquiry, but the very effort to prevent inquiry had, as usual, the effect of adding all the *zest* of prohibition to a subject that had already excited so strong an interest on its own account. The circulation of the Bible was declared illegal, but it spread more widely than before. A few Bible readers were imprisoned, and a few others banished, and the interest increased; and now there can scarcely be less than two thousand people in Florence, who adhere to the word of God alone as their rule of faith. No charge has been brought against them of political partisanship, or of disloyalty to the sovereign; and if one thing is better established than another in connexion with this Tuscan movement in favour of the pure gospel, it is this, that it has nothing to do with politics. The calm, mild, and dignified Guicciardini was no agitator, as all Florence knows, yet he is an exile for conscience' sake. In Malta, in Piedmont, in the Swiss valleys, there are banished men of Tuscany, who have been driven there for the sake of God's own word, "to taste the

savour of other people's bread." In the prisons of Lucca and Volterra—we have the law documents before us—there are cells of the "condemned," and sufferers against whom no other charge has been brought than this, that they read and believed, or taught the Bible. And much more that these documents have not brought to light we might disclose of the measures that have been taken to gratify the resentment of a priestly party, who feel that their power is departing from them.

But to one fact we would call special attention; in these laws and measures affecting the Church, Tuscany is but going hand in hand with Austria. In the empire, the Josephine laws since 1781, like the Leopoldine laws in the weaker state, were unfavourable to Romish pretensions: the two sons of Maria Theresa pursued the same system; but the new laws from Vienna on the 18th and 23d of April 1850, abolishing the *Placet*, or, in other words, annulling the *Exequatur*, and those other measures which have followed in quick succession for the last two years, are undermining the whole legislation of Joseph II. It is a singular fact that Austria, the most unbending and uncompromising supporter of the old *status quo*, that knows no progress and admits no change, should yet in the Imperial Cabinet effect a revolution of her own in favour of the Papacy. The heir of the Holy Roman Empire, and the occupant of the chair of Hildebrand, have leagued themselves together for a common struggle. Their interests are now one, and they must stand or fall together; and their joint aim is to enslave the bodies if they cannot enslave the souls of men. Austria invokes the spiritual terrors which in other days Rome could use so well, and Rome entrusts the defence of her tottering throne to the strong arm of the Croat and the Slaav. France may be the eldest daughter, and may get a kind of hesitating compliment at times, for in truth she has been a wayward child, but Austria is "the sword of the Church." At the head of the new crusade against the minds and consciences of men are, the Princes of Hapsburg and Lorraine. But let not the continental rulers think that they can continue a system of government in opposition to the intelligence of a people, or corrupt with impunity the conscience of their subjects. Those old idols of the Papacy that bigotry or priestcraft is dressing up again—those painted Madonnas that are winking at Rimini most knowingly, or working miracles at Florence, are sadly out of date. The monks and friars and meritorious mendicants, redolent of every odour but that of sanctity, have become almost an anachronism even in the south, and they might be left to die out peaceably. We are not iconoclasts in the grosser sense. We would deprecate as loudly as any the turning of Vallombrosa into a cotton factory; and as for those

fat old fathers of Camaldoli, so hospitable and so fond of snuff, we would not "pull down their nests" about their ears, especially as the disciples of St. Romuald are robed in white, and even our northern metaphysics could scarcely make them out to be "the crows" of a monkish rookery. But we think, in Tuscany, the time has gone by for such things, unless the present efforts of the Papacy succeed in bringing back that "gross darkness" which is their proper element. The fanaticism of the Flagellanti has not been revived—the Knights of Malta exist as yet but in name and tradition; and the Jesuits, like witches by a "running stream," are standing on the bank, but have not crossed the Arno. To force the institutions of the worst times of the Papacy on a comparatively civilized people, against their mind and conscience, is but an idle effort at the best; and to darken and deprave a nation with the idea of making them more peaceful and submissive to both Church and State, is of all expedients the most mistaken. A people without the fear of God will not continue long to honour the king; and if we mistake not the signs of the times, there is a terrible retribution coming to those Continental rulers who have used their power in crushing the conscience of their subjects. An infidel spirit is spreading fast and far among those who cannot as rational men believe the lying legends of the Church of Rome, and who do not seek guidance in the Word of inspiration—a daring and God-defying spirit that makes small account of law either human or divine; and if we mistake not, with this rising infidelity, both despotism and Popery must soon strive hand to hand. *Dies irae dies illa!*

Yet it is perhaps better that the constitution of February has been finally and fully abolished, than that it should exist only in name. It has brought out more distinctly the true state of things, both as to the measures and the men. The once popular Leopold II., and his patriot oath, have become a byword among his people, and we cannot refrain from quoting one stanza of the "Casa Guidi Windows," which perhaps, on the whole, the Grand Duke might consider as slightly personal.

"Why swear at all, thou false Duke Leopold?
What need to swear? What need to boast thy blood
Taintless of Austria, and thy heart unsold
Away from Florence? It was understood
God made thee not too vigorous or too bold,
And men had patience with thy quiet mood,
And women pity, as they saw thee pace
Their festive streets with premature grey hairs:
We turned the mild dejection of thy face
To princely meanings, took thy wrinkling cares
For ruffling hopes, and called thee weak, not base.

Better to light the torches for more prayers,
 And smoke the pale Madonnas at the shrine,
 Being still 'Our poor Grand Duke,' 'Our good Grand Duke,'
 'Who cannot help the Austrian in his line,'
 Than write an oath upon a nation's book
 For men to spit at with scorn's blurring brine!
 Who dares forgive what none can overlook?"

The decree that abolished the *Statuto* dissolved of course that party who had clung to the faded rag of a constitution as the banner under which they were to fight. The two parties are now ABSOLUTISM and DEMOCRACY;—the princes themselves have destroyed, or are fast destroying, that great party who sought to harmonize the rights of the crown with the interests of the people. Should another revolution come,—and who can tell what a day may bring forth!—there can scarcely be a *constitutional* party, for, with the exception of Sardinia, there are no constitutions. The intelligent, enlightened, and liberal advocates of progress are thus made over to Mazzini, and the Italian rulers are doing more to increase his partisans than all the agents of his Central Committee. These reactionary sovereigns must reap the fruit of their own misdoings. If Leopold II., like Charles-Albert or Victor-Emmanuel, had maintained the free institutions he had founded, then, in the event of another attempt to overturn his throne, we believe all Tuscany—(with the single exception of Leghorn, for which we would not like to answer in any such contingency)—would have rallied round the house of Hapsburg-Lorraine: but now when the oath "written on a nation's book" has been shamelessly broken—the pact between prince and people destroyed—the liberty of conscience outraged—the civilisation of a century threatened—however we deplore the struggle that is inevitable, we have but small respect for a nation of crouching slaves, and honour the men of stout heart and strong arm who stand up for their homes and their household gods. And such men there are even in Italy. From Leopold II. little can be expected; for, even excluding his whole Florentine *entourage*, his Austrian relations on the one hand, and his Neapolitan on the other, and above all the influence of Rome acting on his feeble character, have placed him almost beyond the possibility of recovering the position he has lost. But there is much to give hope in the growing intelligence of Tuscany. We do not speak at all of the unfortunate prisoners of the Revolution of 1848-49, who are now under trial in the courts. We cannot sympathize with the attempt then made to overthrow the constitution in favour of a mere fraction of the people. But let them be fairly tried, not by new laws or by old, but by the laws which existed at the time,

in short, by the Constitution with the fulness of its liberties. We do not think the volumes that have been written in their defence have made out a good case in their behalf; and it is humiliating to find such a man as Guerrazzi urging the plea, that while acting ostensibly as Dictator in a democracy he was privately intriguing to bring back the Sovereign! It would have been far nobler to have adhered firmly and manfully to the principle of a republic "one and indivisible," than to have elaborated such a portrait of himself as a mere shuffling intriguer. While we pity the fallen, we cannot sanction the mischievous division they created when Tuscany was advancing towards full constitutional liberty; or the occasion they furnished, and the plea they gave, to a reactionary party to annul those liberties which had been granted and abused.

We know not *how far* the influence of England might yet make itself felt in the affairs of Italy, but the firm remonstrances of a great power, and some appearance of determination to uphold those treaties with which British interests are connected, might prevent more evils than we yet dream of. We have an accomplished and liberal diplomatist at Florence, but he must abide by the instructions of his Government, and Lord Malmesbury, at least, needs the spur of public opinion. The atrocities of Messina were checked by our ships of war in the Mediterranean, no doubt much to the annoyance of certain "allied and friendly" powers;—but as long as Italy remains in its present condition, we are untrue to our own interest and our own character, if we are not in opposition to all retrograde measures. Our ships of war hovering about the coast of Italy are "a terror to evil doers" in the lower part of the Peninsula, and especially to the Court of Rome, that would urge on the *subject States* to any measure of reaction in favour of the Papacy—

"Gens inimica mihi Tyrrhenum navigat æquor."

ART. IV.—1. *Corneille et son Temps : Etude Littéraire*. Par M. GUIZOT. Paris : Didier. 1852.

(*Corneille and His Times*. By M. GUIZOT. London : Bentley. 1852.)

2. *Shakspeare et son Temps : Etude Littéraire*. Par M. GUIZOT. Paris : Didier. 1852.

(*Shakspeare and His Times*. By M. GUIZOT. London : Bentley. 1852.)

ONE looks at these volumes with mingled feelings of pleasure and pity. As the elegant productions of an able and scholarly mind they could not but be welcome at any time ; yet in the fact of their appearance at present there is enough to awaken sad thoughts. A few years ago the author had no leisure for such things : the cares of a nation were upon him, and his hands were deep in civil intrigues and distractions. A blast of French impatience, or, as some believe, of something stronger and better, blew the system with which he was associated to pieces ; and for a while he had his place among our noted exiles. Farther changes have permitted him to return to France ; but these changes have carried France still farther from the situation to which his policy belongs, and it is difficult to foresee that any turn of affairs will bring the country again into a state in which he shall be as prominent in the national politics as he was. In these circumstances, M. Guizot, with a resigned spirit of industry which does him honour, has betaken himself once more to the literary pursuits of his youth. All the world must be glad of it. There are differences of opinion as to the political merits of M. Guizot ; there is no difference of opinion as to his literary talent. He ought to be a favourite author everywhere, and particularly with Englishmen. More solid, accurate, and austere than most of his countrymen, yet highly gifted with that spirit of scientific generality, that tendency to express truths in comprehensive forms, for which the French are remarkable, and of which the English, as some think, have too little, he is precisely the man to exercise a beneficial influence over English readers at the same time that he pleases them. Of all his works known to us, his *History of Civilization in France* deserves the highest praise in this respect. It is a book to be read and read again, not only as a compendium of rich matter relative to the progress of Europe in general, and of France in particular, during the middle ages, but also as an admirable specimen of the scientific mode of treating history. If M. Guizot gives us more such

books now, we shall not regret that he has ceased to be an active politician.

The works before us are republications, with a few changes and additions, of essays published long ago. The pieces which form the volume on Corneille were published as early as 1813, when the author was only twenty-six years of age. They consist of an essay on the state of poetry in France before Corneille; an essay on the life and works of Corneille; and sketches, prepared by the late Madame Guizot, but revised by her husband, of three of Corneille's contemporaries, Chapelain, Rotrou, and Scarron. The volume on Shakspeare consists of an essay on the life and works of Shakspeare, published in 1821, and historical and critical notices of sixteen of Shakspeare's plays; with which is incorporated a review of the state of the dramatic art in France in 1830, written by M. le duc de Broglie on the occasion of the representation on the French stage of Alfred de Vigny's translation of Othello. The two volumes together may be considered as furnishing M. Guizot's confession of faith in poetical matters, particularly as regards the drama.

We must confess that we have found both the volumes less interesting than we expected. We use the word "interest" advisedly. A plea in behalf of "the interesting" in literature seems to us to be much needed at the present time. We would lay it down as a canon that no book can be good that is not (in its kind, and in relation to those who are intellectually competent to its matter) *interesting*. This might seem a truism, were it not practically denied every day by the timidity of our critical judgments. There are many books which pass as good ones, and are praised as deep, solid, and what not, notwithstanding that they are, nay, in some cases, possibly just because they are, transcendently uninteresting. If the style is dull; if there are no gleams of light, no sallies, no brisk allusions; if the matter does not stand out above the surface in clear shape and relief, but only peeps forth here and there, suggesting something amorphous underneath—then, forsooth, the book is a deep one, and the author is a man of heavy metal! People ought to have courage to resist this fashion, and never praise a book that does not interest them. No one is *entitled* to praise a book that does not interest him. True; on the other hand, one is not entitled to *dispraise* a book simply because it does not interest *him*. But to the right kind of reader no good book is dull; and, the right kind of reader being supposed,—that is, a reader intellectually competent to the intrinsic matter of the book, whatever it is,—then, if a book is dull, it is not a good one. We maintain that this canon will sweep the whole range of interesting books from Kant to Pickwick, and fail in no one case. Let it then be made

absolute. Let it be insisted on that every book shall be interesting, shall have as much of the merit of literary fascination as the conditions of its subject will permit. For, after all, it will be found that this very quality of interest, so far from being attainable only at the expense of what is intrinsic, actually increases in proportion as the claims of the intrinsic are attended to ; and that, of any two books on a given subject, the one which satisfies most strictly the deepest conditions of the subject, will also touch most keenly the nerves and the humanities. Even in the "thrilling" interest of novelists such as Eugene Sue, depending as that does in part on the reckless audacity with which, in their coarse fashion, they tear in among the topics of greatest social import and the most agitating to the people, there is, we believe, a lesson for higher literature, could it only be expounded and seen into. On the other hand, such a work as that containing Niebuhr's investigations into early Roman history, of extraordinary merit as these are, would, we believe, have been all the better, even in its own order, if it had been more readable.

In hardly any class of books are there such easy elements of interest for cultivated readers as in the delightful and increasing class to which the works under notice belong. It would be difficult for stupidity itself to make a literary biography totally uninteresting. There are always, in such a case, anecdotes, extracts, and scraps of miscellaneous information, which it costs little trouble to put together, and which serve to amuse. Interest of this kind, therefore, one might have expected from any writer, and especially from any French writer, that should have undertaken to prepare a work, either on *Corneille* and his times, or on *Shakspeare* and his times. It would have been difficult for any writer, in such a case, not to have resuscitated some of the humours of the courts of Richelieu and King James. But, when a writer of M. Guizot's powers undertook to furnish the world with two such literary monographs, it was natural to expect a still higher order of interest. In addition to anecdote, extract, antique reminiscence, and sketches of the society of Paris and London in the seventeenth century, one might have looked for profound criticism, accurate portraiture of individuals, original combinations and interpretations of facts, and fine displays of historic insight. After such a writer had "done" *Corneille* and his times in a volume for the market, one might have expected that that portion of the literary history of France would thenceforth be seen as a defined circle of clear light in the distance of the French past, with all the chief figures of the time distinctly moving in it, and *Corneille* most distinct in the midst. And though as much could hardly have been demanded from his treatment of the English

subject, Shakspeare being a phenomenon which it does not seem to be given to Frenchmen to understand, yet, that his picture would have conveyed to his countrymen some vivid idea of the traits of the "great Williams," as Dumas calls our Swan, and some deep appreciation of English poetry in general, is what might have fairly been anticipated.

These expectations, as we have said, are not fully answered. The books are, indeed, decidedly superior, as books go; and, if we remember the time at which they were written, our estimate of them must be farther enhanced. But, tried by the standard of M. Guizot's reputation, and the capabilities of the subjects, they are somewhat below the mark. Our complaint against them is, that they are not so interesting as they might have been; by which, according to our definition of the word interesting, we mean that they are not the best specimens of M. Guizot's great and peculiar powers.

The volumes certainly contain a great deal of information, pleasant in itself, and collected with considerable pains from authentic sources. That on Corneille, in particular, will, in this respect, be interesting to English readers, whose knowledge of the life and writings of the French tragic poet is necessarily more limited than that of his admiring countrymen. The *mélange* of facts, anecdotes, quotations, and sketches of old Parisian celebrities of the days of Richelieu, given in this volume, will accordingly be very agreeable to such readers among us as are fond of literary history and literary gossip. Even here, however, owing perhaps to M. Guizot's comparative deficiency in that light *esprit* for which Frenchmen of much less ability are remarkable, and which enables them to catch up the humours of a period, and tell them with ease and point, there is more dulness than might have been expected. Much of the information is presented rather in the form to which we used to be accustomed in such dry books as Wharton's History of Poetry, than in the form which the better art of Macaulay, Scott, and other historians of antique literature has now made common. The essay on Poetry in France before Corneille, is indeed full of a kind of interest which Wharton never reaches; but this arises from the critical skill with which the development of the poetic style in France is traced through its successive representatives, De Lorris, De Meun, Marot, Ronsard, and Malherbe, to its maturity in Corneille, rather than from any special liveliness in matter and anecdote. Madame Guizot's portion of the volume is, in this respect, better than her husband's; her sketch of the poor cripple Scarron and his household is, in particular, very touching and graceful. So also, curiously enough, the most lively part of the volume on Shakspeare is the review of

the French stage, and of the performance of Othello before a French audience, contributed by M. de Broglie. The remainder of the volume will, indeed, have the same fortunate advantage, as regards French readers, that the volume on Corneille has, as regards English readers—its information will be for the most part new. In the essay on the life and writings of Shakspeare, for example, the French reader will find accumulated for him all the common stories of the poet's deer-stealing, horse-holding, &c., of which we in this country have got tired, together with many facts relating to the English Theatre of the days of Elizabeth; while, in the appended criticisms on Shakspeare's plays, there are admirable summaries of the original tales from which the poet borrowed his plots, with references to the probable books from which he took them. All this must be interesting to Frenchmen, who are not so Shakspeare-mad as we, and whom more meagre materials than any writer now dare bring to us about our idol will satisfy. What kind of facts M. Guizot relates to his countrymen about the bard of Avon may be judged from the following specimens:—

“In 1586 he (Shakspeare's father) was superseded in his functions as alderman, which he had already for a long time ceased to discharge. Other causes besides poverty may have contributed to his removal. It has been said that Shakspeare was a catholic: it appears at least certain that such was the creed of his father; for, in 1770, a slater, in repairing the roof of the house in which Shakspeare was born, found, between the timber work and the tiles, a manuscript, placed there doubtless at a time of persecution, and containing a profession of the catholic faith, in fourteen articles, all commencing with these words, ‘I, John Shakspeare.’”—*Shakspeare et son Temps*, p. 21.

“Shakspeare was not fifteen years old when he was taken away from school to aid his impoverished father in his business. It must have been then that, according to the tradition of Aubrey, William exercised the bloody functions connected with the trade of a butcher. This supposition is now revolting to the commentators of the poet; but a circumstance related by Aubrey hardly permits of doubt on the point, and reveals, at the same time, this young imagination even then incapable of submitting to vile employments without attaching to them some idea, some sentiment, ennobling them. ‘When he killed a calf,’ Aubrey was told by the country people of the neighbourhood, ‘he would do it in a high style, and make a speech,’ (*‘Il le faisait avec pompe et prononçait un discours.’*) Who does not see the tragic poet inspired by the spectacle of death, were it but that of an animal, and seeking to render it imposing or pathetic? Who does not figure to himself the scholar of thirteen or fourteen years, his head full of his first literary acquirements, his mind struck, perhaps, by some theatrical representation, elevating, in a poetic transport, the

animal he was about to strike, to the dignity of a victim, or, perhaps, even of a tyrant."—*Ibid.* pp. 22, 23.

What our Colliers and our Halliwells will say to the first of these stories (Guizot in this volume gives no references to authorities) we do not know. The controversy as to the religion of Shakspeare's father is familiar to every one; but the episode of the slater is new to us. We wonder if the manuscript was in old Mr. Shakspeare's own handwriting, as that would be of some importance in connexion with another controversy, the existence of which M. Guizot does not seem to be aware of. Altogether the story is worth its weight in gold, and biographers are fools not to have made more use of it. Fancy the glimpse it gives into the household of the old alderman of Stratford, the father of "nine, ten, or perhaps even eleven children," as M. Guizot has somehow ascertained, William being "the third or fourth," and the first boy! There must have been stuff in an old fellow, (more wit than courage though,) who, when a storm of persecution was blowing, fell upon the notable device of writing out his profession of faith, or getting it written out for him, and then poking it into a hole in the roof of the house for posterity to find—thus at once protecting his skin, saving his conscience, and enjoying a joke. The story, you see, is the most likely in the world. And then so like his son, too! Did not Shakspeare the younger do exactly the same thing? Did he not also take the precaution of depositing his real profession of faith in the roof of a house, so that posterity might discover it in due time; and has not a slater been and gone the other day to the hiding-hole, and found out that Shakspeare was an Atheist?

The story of the calf, too, what a new turn M. Guizot has given to it! The story in Aubrey is, that he, gleaning information from among the country people about Stratford, some thirty or forty years after Shakspeare's death, heard that, when the poet was a boy (*i.e.*, some eighty years before) he used to assist his father in his trade as a butcher, and that when he killed a calf he did not do it like anybody else, but with a flourish and an oration. To a dull English imagination, this story, taking it for true, is rather humorous than otherwise. One sees the young poet, with his knife in his right hand, and his left on the neck of the calf, not proceeding in a stolid butcherly way to kill the animal without sharing the pleasure with any one else, but turning first to the boys and girls gathered round him in the backyard, and, with that gift of fluency which he always possessed, improving the occasion with a speech. The speech, we fancy, might pretty frequently run thus: "Here is a calf; cutlets are necessary; I'll kill the calf—I'll kill him." This

would be when he felt the full flurry of the moment; but sometimes he might be more staid and theatrical—"Ye boys of Stratford, lo! I kill a calf;" and sometimes pathos might predominate, and there would be an allusion to the feelings of the calf's mother. So we fancy the incident, always supposing that it ever happened. But the imagination of M. Guizot is more reverent. In his picture of the incident one sees no such vulgar boy of Stratford, but a white-robed young flamen with upturned eyes, performing solemnly an act of sacrifice, or a juvenile Brutus enacting in thought the part of a stern tyrannicide. This, we take it, is French imagination, imagination *à la mode Française*.

Our readers will pardon us for taking note, rather too distinctly as it may seem, of these trifles. We do not think them trifles. There is too strong a tendency among our biographers to catch up any stories, probable or not, that may come in their way as they seek for matter for their volumes; and though we have learnt, we trust, to keep this habit in check, and to treat tradition more rigorously in our biographies of Shakspeare, there is no safeguard, unless it be in ridicule from this side of the water, against the currency for a long time to come of such loose *Shakspeariana* in France. If Guizot offends in this respect, what are we to expect from other Frenchmen who may write about the "great Williams?" Besides, in the second of the two cases mentioned, there is a deeper reason for special notice. In the curious sentimental transmutation to which Aubrey's story—a story with which we have no other quarrel than that it wants authentication—is treated when it passes into Guizot's mind, we see traces of a radical defect of view which appears and reappears throughout the whole volume. The same difference that there is between the English and the French picture of Aubrey's legendary incident, the same difference is there between the English and the French appreciation of the poetry of Shakspeare. This will become evident as we proceed.

Passing, however, from the minutiae to the more general impressions of the works before us, we have to remark as an additional reason for a want of interest in them proportionate to the claims of their splendid subjects, the absence of any sufficiently vigorous and sustained attempt to portray the characters of the men described. Whatever else the first volume had aimed at, it should surely have aimed at depositing in the mind of the reader a distinct and finished portrait of the man Corneille. We do not speak here of that precise and elaborate account of the peculiarities of his genius which was to be derived from a critical investigation into his writings, but of that more popular

delineation of his physiognomy, habits, and circumstances as a man and a Parisian of the seventeenth century, which, though it could not have been prepared without the aid of his writings, might have been derived in the main from external records. We do not assert, either, that no description is given of Corneille under this aspect, or that the volume fails in conveying what may pass for a real likeness of its principal subject; we only say that M. Guizot has not *sufficiently* made this a point to be accomplished, and that he has not succeeded in painting Corneille in this volume with the same distinctness, for example, with which, in his *Civilization in France*, he has painted the portrait of Charlemagne. Materials, we should suppose, were not more defective in the one case than in the other; it even seems that it would be far easier to add a distinct and authentic likeness of Corneille to the portrait gallery of eminent Frenchmen, than a similar portrait of Charlemagne. What was wanting was only the conviction that it ought to be done, and resolution and patient art to do it. In the case of Shakspeare the omission, while it is more obvious, is also more excusable. If his own countrymen cannot agree upon the portrait of the poet, if there are as many ways of describing him even in English as there are English biographers of him, it was not to be expected that a foreign biographer would venture on any very specific delineation. Better, perhaps, that he should leave the face and figure of the great unknown as hypothetical as he found them. And yet we think, with all allowance, that M. Guizot might have done a little more in this respect than he has attempted. Who has ever looked at a cast or an engraving of the Stratford bust, with its full and mobile, yet small-featured face, so thoroughly the face of a literary man rather than a man of action; who has ever read Ben Jonson's gossip about Shakspeare and his contemporaries with Drummond of Hawthornden; nay, who has ever critically read Shakspeare's own poems, and especially his minor poems, without forming an image of the poet and his ways which he knows *must* be so far authentic? Besides, it is impossible to write about any man without having *some* image of him and his circumstances, true or false, before the mind's eye; and, true or false, this image will appear in the mere tenor of the narrative, whether it is expressly set forth or not. It is not, therefore, that there is no indication in the present volume of the impression entertained by M. Guizot respecting the character and personal environment of Shakspeare; it is that M. Guizot has taken no pains to make this impression distinct and vivid to himself or his readers, and that the impression, so far as it is possible to gather it, is poor and unreal.

That our readers may judge for themselves of the truth of these remarks, we shall quote the passages in which the nearest approach is made to a specific delineation of the two men.

Corneille in his relations with Richelieu, the courtiers, and the critics of his time.—"At this juncture in his history, when Corneille is about to enter personally into the lists in opposition to such powerful enemies, it is necessary that we should obtain a complete idea of his character and position, in order to be able rightly to judge both of the necessity for making concessions, and of the courage requisite for resistance. Corneille was immediately dependent upon the Cardinal, whom, in a letter to Scudery, he calls 'your master and mine.' This expression shocked Voltaire; but it was not at all at variance with the customs of Corneille's time. At a period when gentlemen of the highest birth entered the service of others more rich than themselves; when money was the natural price paid for all services, and wealth a sort of suzerainty which collected around itself vassals ready to pay it a kind of homage that was considered perfectly legitimate, we need not be surprised that a burgess of Rouen felt no shame in considering himself a domestic, or, if you prefer it, a subject of an all-powerful minister, whose liberality was his mainstay, and in whose favour his hopes were centred. . . . We shall meet with many actions and words, in the life of Corneille, utterly at variance with our ideas and habits. We shall pass with surprise from his tragedies to his dedicatory epistles; and we shall blush to see the same hand—

La main qui crayonna

L'âme du grand Pompée et l'esprit de Cinna,—

stretched forth, if we may be allowed the expression, to solicit liberalities which it did not always obtain. . . . Let us first look at Corneille in his social relations. Destitute of all that distinguishes a man from his equals, he seems to be irrevocably doomed to pass unnoticed in the crowd. His appearance is common, his conversation dull, his language incorrect, his timidity awkward, his judgment uncertain, and his experience perfectly childish. If he finds himself brought into contact, either by necessity or chance, with persons whom birth or fortune has placed above him, he does not rightly appreciate the position which he occupies in respect to them, but thinks only of the one connexion—of protector and protected—which subsists between him and them. Of all their different titles to consideration he regards only the claims which they may possibly have to his gratitude, and thus he will place a Montauron on a level with, if not above, Richelieu and Mazarin. It is always possible to determine by the nature of the homage which Corneille pays, the amount of the reward he received for it. . . . But [M. Guizot here quotes *La Bruyère*] 'let him elevate himself by composition, and he is not inferior to Augustus, Pompey, Nicomedes, or Heraclius. He is then a king, and a great king; he is a politician—nay more, he is a philosopher.' He has passed into a new sphere; a new horizon has opened before him; he has escaped from the trammels of a position

which bound down his imagination to the interests of a fortune far inferior to his faculties; he can now appreciate all the duties necessarily imposed upon generous souls, by an important existence, a lofty destiny, and the possibility and expectation of glory; and with all the force of deep inward conviction, he has laid upon his heroes obligations which he had not been accustomed to attach to the humble social existence of Pierre Corneille. . . . There is, however, one point on which he is raised by this existence above the vulgar herd—his works issued from the obscurity in which his life was spent. By his literary renown he acquired public importance, and thenceforward he regarded his renown as an object of duty. In his works he pays proper respect to himself; with them was connected not only the honour of his glory, but also the dignity of his character; he would deem himself degraded if he did not acknowledge their merit with all the frankness and boldness of a champion entrusted with their defence, or if he consented to abdicate the rank in which they had placed him. ‘It is not your fault,’ he says to Scudery, ‘that, from that *first rank* in which I am placed by many competent persons, I have not descended lower even than Claveret.’ . . . Nevertheless, even while defending himself so proudly, Corneille did not depart from the ordinary ideas and habits of his conduct, or those which concerned him as a man and not as a poet. He evidently believed in two very distinct kinds of honour, which it appeared to him all the more ridiculous to confound together, as he made no use at all of one of them. The same man who, in the *Cid*, had dilated so loftily upon the duties imposed by honour upon brave men, did not think it necessary to fulfil those duties himself; and, looking at his physical courage as entirely unconcerned in the question, he thus replied to Scudery’s rhodomontades: ‘There is no necessity for knowing how much nobler or more valiant you may be than myself, in order to judge how far superior the *Cid* is to the *Amant Libéral*. I am not a fighting man; so, in that respect, you have nothing to fear.’ So strong was his conviction that the honour of Corneille did not depend upon physical courage.”—*Corneille and his Times*, pp. 173-181.

Shakspeare in London, and at Stratford.—“Externally, however, his existence seems to have pursued a tranquil course. His name is not mixed up with any literary quarrel; and, but for the malicious allusions of the envious Ben Jonson, hardly a criticism would associate itself with the eulogiums which mark its superiority. All the records of the time exhibit to us Shakspeare placed at last as he had the right to pretend to, sought after for the charm of his character, as much as for the pleasure of his wit, and the admiration due to his genius. A glance cast into the affairs of the poet proves also that he began to carry into the details of his life, that regularity and order which are necessary for respectability. He is seen purchasing in succession in his native district a house and different pieces of land, of which he formed at last a property sufficient to ensure an easy life. The profits which he derived from the theatre in his capacity

as author and actor, have been valued at two hundred pounds sterling a year, a considerable sum for that time; and if the favours of Lord Southampton were added to the economy of the poet, we may infer at least that he did not employ them ill. . . . Like Molière, Shakspeare, if we except his intimacy with Lord Southampton, sought above all his habitual relations among the men of letters, whose social condition he had probably contributed to raise. The *Mermaid Club*, founded by Sir Walter Raleigh, and where Shakspeare, Ben Jonson, Beaumont, Fletcher, &c., used to meet, was long celebrated for the wit-combats between Ben Jonson and Shakspeare, a frivolous amusement, in which the vivacity of the latter gave him an immense advantage over the laborious slowness of his rival. The examples that are quoted are hardly worth the trouble of collecting. Few *bons mots* can have a career of two centuries. . . . Who would not think that a life thus become honourable and pleasant would long keep Shakspeare in the midst of social circles suitable to the requirements of his wit, and in the theatre of his glory? Yet, in 1613 or 1614 at the latest, three or four years after having obtained from James I. the direction of the Blackfriars Theatre, and though one cannot discern that there was any displeasure towards him either on the part of the king to whom he owed this new favour, or on the part of the public whom he had just presented with *Othello* and the *Tempest*, Shakspeare quitted London and the theatre to go to live at Stratford, in his house of *New Place*, and in the middle of his fields. Did he begin to feel the want of family life? If so, he might have brought his wife and children to London. Nothing indicates that he had been much put about by this separation. During his stay in London he made, it is said, frequent journeys to Stratford; but he is accused of finding even on the road distractions of the same kind as had consoled him at least for the absence of his wife. . . . If the Sonnets of Shakspeare were to be regarded as an expression of his most habitual and cherished feelings, one would be astonished at never finding there a single word relative to his home or his children, even the son he had lost at the age of twelve. Yet Shakspeare cannot have been ignorant of paternal affection; he who in *Macbeth* has painted, &c., could not have looked at his own children without feeling the tenderness of a father's heart. But Shakspeare, as his character presents itself to us, was a man to find, for a long period, in the distractions of society that which could hold, in his thoughts and life, the place he was capable of giving to the affections. However this may be, it is more difficult to fix on the causes which determined his departure from London than to perceive those which may have prolonged his stay there. Perhaps some infirmities had come to warn him of the necessity of repose; perhaps also the very natural desire to show in his native place a style of life so different from that which he had brought from it, induced him to hasten the moment of renouncing labours which had no longer for their recompense the pleasures of youth. . . . New pleasures could not be wanting to Shakspeare in his retreat. A natural tendency to enjoy all things ren-

dored equally fit for the happiness of a quiet life him whom it had drawn from the vicissitudes of a life of agitation. The first mulberry tree introduced into the neighbourhood of Stratford, and planted by the hands of Shakspeare in a corner of his garden at New Place, attested for more than a century the gentle simplicity of the occupations that filled up his days. An easy competence, the esteem and friendship of his neighbours, all seemed to promise that which crowns so well a brilliant life—a tranquil and honoured old age—when, on the 23d of April 1616, the very day on which he attained his fifty-second year, death removed him from this condition of calm and comfort, whose happy leisure he would perhaps have not always given up to repose alone.”—*Shakspeare et son Temps*, pp. 123-127.

From writers of less ability than M. Guizot this might be accepted as very good character-drawing. What is actually said both of Corneille and of Shakspeare, is probably in the right direction; and, with the exception of a certain tinge of the false in the estimate of Shakspeare, arising from one or two minute inaccuracies as to facts and dates which we could point out in the paragraphs quoted, there is perhaps nothing that would require to be positively altered or struck out. But the delineation in both instances is too light, conventional, and irresolute. Both Corneille and Shakspeare, we venture to say, had good decided faces of their own, not in the least like each other, and which, when once seen, impressed themselves so that there could be no difficulty in remembering or recognising them afterwards. Now, though we will not say that, if we had met Corneille coming out of Richelieu's door in Paris, or seen Shakspeare standing by the mulberry tree in the garden at New Place, we should not have had a suspicion, from M. Guizot's descriptions, that the ungainly shopkeeper-looking man with the manuscript in his hand, was Corneille, and the mild elderly gentleman, Shakspeare; we are not sure how much in this case would have depended on our prior knowledge that the door was Richelieu's, and the garden, the garden of New Place, Stratford. Had we met the mild gentleman at Richelieu's door, we might have supposed him to be Corneille; and had we seen the ungainly shopkeeper-looking man going up the gravel-walk at New Place, reading a manuscript, we might have supposed him to be Shakspeare reading one of his plays. And the reason is, that while M. Guizot suggests the ungainliness in the one case, and the mildness in the other, (supposing that these *are* the real characteristics,) he does not do so firmly and impressively, like a painter sure that he is painting from the life. How much more graphic respecting Corneille are the contemporary allusions which M. Guizot's want of art has obliged him to add in foot-notes, instead of involving them in the text—as, for ex-

ample, the saying of Fontenelle, "M.^r Corneille was rather large and full of body, and very simple and common in appearance;" or the declarations of Vigneul Marville, "the first time I saw him I took him for a shopkeeper," and "his conversation was so dull that it became burdensome, even if it lasted only a short time;" which last is good-humouredly confirmed by Corneille himself, when he says that "people could rarely hear him without getting tired, unless when he spoke through the mouths of others!" There is the germ, indeed, of a very fine appreciation in the view which M. Guizot gives of Corneille as at one moment the poet nerved even morally up to the pitch of his own glowing intellectual conceptions, making kings and heroes stalk across the stage, and filling their hearts with all kingly resolves and their mouths with all kingly speeches, and then the next moment dropping plump down, amid the circumstances and needs of his own individual life, into an awkward timid creature, respecting every body, and saying what any body that had money wanted him to say, so long, always, as they did not again rouse the lion in him by attacks on his literary reputation. But even this is only suggested, and the reader has to work out the view for himself. As regards Shakspeare, there is even a greater want of decidedness in seizing the indisputable characteristics. If that general mildness and tolerance of spirit is suggested, which all the biographers seem to be agreed upon, there is no qualification of this by the addition of those traits which are infallibly indicated by contemporary allusions which M. Guizot himself must have met with in his researches, as, for example, the trait of excessive fluency in speech, certified by Ben Jonson, or by the incorporation of those deeper hints of intense spiritual significance which are to be derived as authentically from the poet's own writings. M. Guizot makes reference to the Sonnets, but he shews no adequate sense of their biographic value.

A comparison of these "studies" of M. Guizot with the similar writings of Macaulay, or any other of our most celebrated biographic essayists, will illustrate what we have been saying, and will make it manifest that Guizot's highest talent does not lie in character-painting. He excels ordinary writers here as in other things; but this is not his most notable point of superiority. Naturally more at home in the region either of research or of abstract thought, he has not that instinctive facility in dealing with the concrete, that artist's power of divining the characteristic attitudes of the men he describes, and representing them against backgrounds of cunningly-imagined circumstance, which other writers of our day possess; nor has he attempted in the present instances to repair this defect in the

only way in which it can be repaired, namely, by laborious investigation, the systematic accumulation of particulars so as to evolve a general idea. This last, to judge from his historical works, few men could have done better.

It may be said, however, that this is too severe a test to apply to publications put forth as mere "literary studies" by a man who has done so much work besides, and one of them, too, put forth at so early a period of his literary life. Setting aside, however, the fact that the earlier of these studies is the better and more finished of the two, we cannot admit that the test in question is too severe to be applied to literary studies, of which such a man as M. Guizot is the author, and such men as Corneille and Shakspeare the subjects. We would apply the same test, if necessary, to any of Macaulay's essays, which are still less pretending in form. But, leaving this matter to be decided according to taste, we shall insist no more upon the merits or demerits of the books, considered with reference to their success as biographies, but shall turn to the examination of them, in what may after all be their more intentional character, as treatises of literary criticism. Here, at all events, it will be admitted, they are to be tried by the highest standard; for in whatever shape a critic puts forth his opinions, whether in a folio or in a pamphlet, the opinions themselves are as long and broad as the chances of their application, and it is with the opinions that we have to do.

There are two styles or methods of literary criticism at present in practice. There is, first, that style or method of criticism which views literary works not so much in themselves as in relation to humanity either in the individual or in the epoch. According to this view of criticism, the business of a critic is to regard a poem or other work of literary art as an illustration, expression, or, if we may so speak, secretion of the whole mental state of the contemporary period. What he has to do, therefore, is to establish generally and make clear in particular cases this reciprocal relation; to show of any given book, on the one hand, how it is a development of the foreknown genius of the man, or, on the other hand, reversing the process, how the man may be inferred and construed out of it. Literary criticism, so understood, allies itself, it will at once be seen, with biography and history. Books are stript of that *prestige* which would exempt them from the common lot and the common measure of human things, and authorship is brought down into co-equality and competition with all the thousand other modes of human activity. As battles are the warrior's tribute to civilisation, and signs of the social tendencies at work in the time, so books are the good or bad deeds of the author towards the race, and the

symptoms of the social condition out of which they spring. One might fairly ask in this view, though without much hope of an answer, which is deeper in point of significance, or higher in point of merit—a sonnet or a skirmish, a treatise or a victory, a Waterloo or an *In Memoriam*? Now we are great admirers of this theory and this art of literary criticism. We think that it proceeds at once on a nobler view of literature and a more profound philosophy of human nature; and we believe that the finest feats of modern criticism are to be traced to its growing prevalence. True, it brings us into contact with great difficulties. In the case of a Dante, a Byron, a Burns, or any others of the so-called “subjective” poets, who write out almost professedly their own feelings and experience, the method spontaneously forces itself into view; and hence in these cases criticism *has* always gone hand in hand with Biography and History. But how apply the method to the so-called “objective” class of writers, whose productions are, to all appearance, not revelations of self, but merely shapes and phantasies in ideal matter? How, for example, deduce a *Cid* or a *Cinna* from the personal existence of a Corneille; or how refer the noble sentiments of those heroes who dared all for honour, to their spring in the soul of a man who would have made any apology in the world for any act of his life rather than face a pistol? Or, to take a still more curious example, which would fall strictly under the same head, how identify the grandeur of the *Novum Organum* with the life of Lord Chancellor Bacon? Was he, as the poet says, the meanest of mankind, and, if so, *could* he be the wisest, and *can* his *Organum* be a great book? These are problems which we have as yet no calculus to solve, and yet which necessarily arise out of that view of criticism which we have been describing. Meanwhile, therefore, we must still fall back, in a great measure, upon that other kind of criticism which is consecrated by the practice of all ages, and which consists in viewing the productions of literature, not in their relation either to the personal history of their authors, or to the peculiarities of the social progress at the time when they were written, but simply as exercises in a special art, which has or may have its own principles and rules. It was Wordsworth, we think, who maintained that this should be the only kind of criticism, and that it was not proper, in investigating the works of a poet, to make any reference to the man. Except as a precaution against the mere impertinence of contemporary gossip, or against shallow judgments respecting the lives of literary men of previous times, we have no respect for this maxim, and even think it likely to do harm. Still, precisely as there may be a criticism of battles, apart altogether from considerations of their social meaning, as mere exercises in an art

whose principles are fixed or may be fixed, so there may be a criticism of books apart from all consideration of their biographical or historical significance. A tragedy may be viewed as a tragedy; it may be gone over in detail, and its beauties or its blemishes detected and explained; the plot, characters, language, division into scenes, &c., may be all tried according to certain principles which regulate, or are supposed to regulate, this species of composition; if there are deviations from these principles and still the effect is fine, the reasons for this may be assigned, and the assumed principles shewn accordingly to be so far modifiable; the tragedy may be compared with previous works of the same kind, and its special merits or defects, as a whole, may be thus more clearly brought out—and all this may be done without any retrospective allusion to the character and circumstances of the author, notwithstanding that it is well understood all the while that the tragedy could not have been what it is, had not the author been precisely such and such a man, situated precisely in such and such circumstances. Only Shakspeare could have written *King Lear*; and yet, once written and published, *King Lear* is an existence by itself which may walk loose about the world, and be studied by men as one of many similar things belonging to a common denomination, without ever referring to its parentage. The best collection of principles in this kind of criticism, particularly as regards the Drama, is perhaps that contained in the *Poetics* of Aristotle. A masterly analysis of the laws of dramatic effect, so far as these accorded with the Greek mind, or had been exhibited in Greek examples, this treatise has come down to us with all the weight that antique authority can give it as a permanent rule in literature.

In the works before us we have a mixture of both kinds of criticism. The writings of the great French and those of the great English dramatist are studied in connexion with their lives and with the social peculiarities and tendencies of their times; and yet there are independent criticisms of these writings as separate and individual exercises in the dramatic art. As might have been expected from a writer so full of the historic spirit as M. Guizot, the volume abounds, in particular, in lucid and ingenious remarks on the intimate affinities between history and literature. Perhaps the finest specimen of the author's powers in this respect is that furnished by the newly written preface to the "*Corneille*," which consists of a critical appreciation of the influence exercised over the spirit of recent French literature by the three great literary powers that represented the French intellect during the Empire of Napoleon—the *Journal des Débats*, Chateaubriand, and Madame de Stael. We must content ourselves, however, with quoting from the body of the volume one

remark on a more general topic. It is evidently a remark to which M. Guizot attaches great value, for he has repeated it in the "*Shakspeare.*" It comes very suitably after what we have been saying:—

Complexity of the Causes which determine the Character of Modern Literature.—"Conjectures founded upon the natural progress of the human mind fail when we have to account for the course pursued by the literature of modern times. Among a people whose character is formed in a simple manner, and whose civilisation is the result of the free and harmonious development of the human mind, the question of the origin of literature, although somewhat complicated in itself, is not very difficult of solution: the answer must be sought for and will be found in the spontaneous expansion of our nature. Poetry, the first outburst of a budding imagination in the midst of a world that is new to it, then finds in all surrounding objects themes for its songs, and derives from the simplest sights a host of sensations previously unknown. . . . The Greeks took delight in song; and Homer sang,—he sang the victories of his fellow-countrymen, their quarrels and reconciliations, their games and festivals, their business and their pleasures. On the shield of Achilles are displayed flocks, harvests, and vintages; conjugal affection gives tenderness to the farewells of Andromache; Priam is a father weeping over the loss of his son; and Achilles utters the laments of friendship over the body of Patroclus. Thus the most natural feelings and the simplest interests were what inspired the muse of the prince of poets. . . . If Homer had disappeared, and it were possible to invent him, it would be said: Such a man he must have been—an exemplification of that which could not fail to be produced by the development of the happiest faculties among a people at liberty to display them all, and among whom nothing had occurred to distort their character, to disturb their harmony, or to divert their course. . . . Such could not be the case with regard to modern nations. When they established themselves on the ruins of a world that had already grown old, they were ignorant and incapable of comprehending those institutions from which their coarse manners were about to receive some forms equally rude and more incoherent. A divine religion, coming down into the midst of nations at once enlightened and corrupted by a long term of existence; a sublime morality, based on the precepts of the Gospel, too perfect for the manners of those who are about to receive it, and yet sufficiently positive to exact their obedience; towns and palaces, which had been conquered, and were inhabited by savages incompetent to appreciate the skill which had erected them; luxury for which they had acquired a taste, and to which they became habituated, before they had learned its use; enjoyments, distinctions, and titles which had been invented by the vanity of an effeminate world, and which were paraded by barbarian vanity rather in imitation than from necessity—all these facts could not fail to strike these new peoples as being one of those strange and confused spectacles at which ignorant

spectators cannot even manifest sufficient astonishment, because they do not perceive its hidden springs and secret workings; all these causes necessarily led to that confusedness of ideas, to those fantastic and incomplete associations of thought, of which modern *littérateurs*, in their early essays, and even in their masterpieces, present traces which, though varying in distinctness, are everywhere visible. . . . It is this complication of causes in the manners of the Middle Ages, this singular mixture of natural barbarism and acquired civilisation, of antiquated notions and modern ideas, which renders it very difficult to explain the course pursued by the various literatures that issued from these times.”—*Corneille and his Times*, pp. 2-8.

This remark, the full force of which will at once reveal itself to the intelligent reader, forms a very fit introduction to volumes which have it for their purpose to appreciate the genius and influence of two men so pre-eminently instrumental in determining and stimulating, the one for France and the other for England, the vast literary movement of modern times, the offspring of that Germanic chaos. Corneille is the admitted father of French tragedy, and one of the earliest of the really classic authors in any department of French literature. His influence on the subsequent form and direction of that literature has been very great as to degree, and very marked as to kind. Had he not lived it is very probable that French literature would have now presented a somewhat different assemblage of characteristic qualities. Corneille's is therefore a really national literary name, deservedly ranked by Frenchmen along with those of Rabelais, Molière, Racine, Lafontaine, Bossuet, Rousseau, and Voltaire, all of whom have impressed in succession the stamp of their own intellectual features on the mind of the French people. A similar place, as regards English literature, belongs to Shakspeare. True, in having produced a Chaucer, England has a right to go farther back than France can for the source and commencement of her strictly great literature. True, also, Shakspeare, by the vast dimension and the towering height of his genius, transcends the order of mere national poets. If he is to be defined as related by special affinities to any particular portion of the human race at all, he ought to be defined rather as the poet of the Teutonic nations as a whole, than as the poet exclusively of England. Even within England his position as a national poet differs wholly from that of Corneille in France. What Homer was to the Greeks, and what Dante is to the Italians—this, rather than what Corneille is to the French, is Shakspeare to Englishmen. He is *the* one of all, rather than one among many. Yet Shakspeare has his more special historical relations, too; and, if in the order of power and duration of influence he stands apart, yet, in the order of successive action, he forms one of a

list including such other names as Chaucer, Spenser, Milton, Pope, Wordsworth, and Byron. If it fell to Corneille in France to do much towards converting the general literary movement of modern times, so far as it affected France, into that which we now recognise as the French form of literature, it fell to Shakspeare in a still higher degree to perform the same service for the mind of England. They were both, if not the founders of, at least great dynastic powers in, their respective literatures.

A word or two first on the genius of Corneille. M. Guizot has accomplished this part of his task in many respects beautifully. He first prepares the field for the advent of Corneille, by showing how the French taste in poetry, and the resources of French verse, as originally exhibited in the *Roman de Rose* and other obsolete productions of the chivalry period, had been modified and tested by a series of minor court-poets, the principal of whom were Marot, Ronsard, and Malherbe. He shows how the drama, popular in its origin in France, as in all other countries, had become, towards the close of the sixteenth century, the most hopeful and characteristic portion of an infant literature. He indicates how much had been done or was being done in this department, and more especially for French comedy, by such writers as Jodelle, Garnier, Mariet, Rotrou, and Hardy. Into this field he introduces Corneille. Born at Rouen in 1606, and brought up for the profession of the bar, the future tragic-poet made his first dramatic essays in comedy. He had written various pieces of this kind, which were acted in Paris with more or less of success, and which struck the critics of the day by a certain strength of sense, and logical firmness of style, then unknown to the stage, when accident, and reflection on his own powers, turned his attention to tragedy. His first attempt in this style was the *Médée*, a kind of paraphrase from Seneca, in some portions of which, according to Voltaire, Corneille clearly flashed forth in all his superiority, and which at least drew from the contemporary English poet Waller this high compliment, that "though the others made plenty of verses, Corneille alone could think." But Corneille's first master-piece was the *Cid*, published in 1636. This piece established his reputation as the first poet of the day in France. There was, indeed, a storm of criticism in private circles; and Richelieu, who at that time was unfriendly to Corneille, did his best to have him crushed by the adverse opinion of the Academy; but the popular voice was unanimous, and the poet's position remained unshaken. The *Cid* was rapidly followed up by other pieces, some of which were even superior, and almost all of which were triumphs,—*Les Horaces*, *Cinna*, *Polyeucte*, *Pompée*, *Le Menteur*, *Rodogune*, *Heraclius*, *Théodore*, *Andromède*, *Don Sanche d'Arragon*, *Nicomède*,

and *Pertharite*. The last,* indeed, was a failure, from which the poet did not recover himself in any of his subsequent attempts; and, before his death in 1684, he saw his fame eclipsed by the younger glories of Racine and Molière. Posterity, however, seeing the three poets at an equal distance, is able now to do justice in turn to the peculiar merits of each. Let us hear how M. Guizot characterizes the genius and "mission" of Corneille:

"If Corneille accomplished the revolution which regenerated our drama, or rather, if he exercised that creative action which liberated our drama from its primitive chaos, it was because he introduced into his writings *truth*, which was then banished from all poetical compositions. That energy, that imposing majesty, those sublime soarings of genius, all those qualities which gained Corneille the title of 'the great,' are personal merits which have immortalized the name of the poet, without preserving, after him, any dominant influence over dramatic art. Tragedy might be beautiful otherwise than as Corneille conceived it, and Corneille has remained great without preventing other great men from taking a place beside him. But tragedy could gain life only by repairing to that fountain of truth which Corneille was the first to discover. Before his appearance, every day seemed to remove the public and the poets farther from it; and every day buried the treasures of the human heart more deeply beneath the fantastic inventions of false wit and a disordered imagination. Corneille was the first to reveal these treasures to dramatic art, and to teach it how to use them. On this ground he is rightfully regarded as the father, and the *Cid* as the origin, of French tragedy. . . . It is impossible to imagine what Corneille's genius would have become, and to define either the extraordinary beauties which it might have unfolded, or the flights of which it might have been guilty, if he had boldly abandoned himself to his own guidance. As regarded his own personal knowledge, Corneille was in almost the same position as Shakspeare and Calderon; but his age and country were more civilized than theirs, and criticism availed itself, for the instruction of the poet, of all the acquirements of his age and country. Corneille feared and braved criticism, and provoked it by his defiance; he would allow none of its censures, but he did all he could to avoid them. Taking warning by a first attack, he no longer ventured to hazard, for fear of Scudery, all that France would probably have applauded. Incapable of yielding to his adversaries, and angry at being obliged to combat them, he withdrew from the path on which he was likely to meet them; and though this perhaps involuntary prudence saved him from some dangerous quicksands, it undoubtedly deprived him of some precious discoveries. The success of the *Cid* did not efface, in his mind, the censure of the Academy. In that drama he had allowed himself to depict, with irresistible truth, the transports of passion; but when he found Chimène's love so severely condemned, Corneille, doubtless alarmed at what he might find in the weakness of the heart, looked in future only to its

strength; he sought for the resisting element in man, and not for the yielding, and thus became acquainted with only the half of man. And as admiration is the feeling chiefly excited by heroic resistance, it was to *admiration* that the dramatic genius of Corneille principally addressed itself. . . . [Here follows a disquisition in which M. Guizot contends, against the opinion of Boileau and Voltaire, that admiration does hold a legitimate place among the tragic passions, and is as suitable for dramatic effect as pity, terror, and the like. He believes, however, that Corneille has overdone it, and is too monotonously sublime.] . . . More conflicts of passion, and a little more weakness, would have rendered Corneille's heroes more constantly true and dramatic; even their virtue, which may often be regarded as the principal personage of the piece, would have interested us more, if, though equally able to conquer, it had been attacked by more potent foes, and had visibly incurred greater dangers. All the vigour of his noble genius was requisite to discover a sufficient source of interest in those singular characters which he alone could create and sustain; he alone has succeeded in awakening our uncertainty and curiosity by their very inflexibility, which, as it is announced at the outset, does not permit them to yield to the slightest weakness, and multiplies successively around them embarrassments which ceaselessly necessitate greater and more extraordinary efforts. . . . In order to attain to this invincible power, which will make all around it bend to its influence, a man must absolutely have separated himself from all that otherwise enters into the composition of human nature; he must have completely ceased to think of all that, in real life, occurs to alter the forms of that ideal grandeur of which the imagination can conceive no possibility except when, isolating it, so to speak, from all other affections, it forgets that which renders its realization so difficult and so infrequent. The imagination of Corneille had no difficulty in lending itself to this isolation; the loftiness of his inventions was sustained by his inexperience in the common affairs of life; as he introduced into his own ordinary actions none of those ideas which he employed in the creation of his heroes, so in the conception of his heroes he employed none of the ideas of which he made use in ordinary life. He did not place Corneille himself in their position: the observation of nature did not occupy his attention; a happy inspiration frequently led him to divine it; but his unassisted imagination, gathering together outlines of a far more simple character, composed for him a sort of abstract model of a single quality, a being without parts, if I may be allowed the expression, capable of being set in motion by a single impulse, and of proceeding in a single direction. . . . To the same cause also must be attributed the variableness of Corneille's maxims, though they are always expressed with the most absolute confidence; and in this way we must explain how it is that his morality is sometimes so severe and sometimes so lax—that he sometimes enunciates principles of the sternest republicanism, and sometimes of the most servile obedience. The fact is, that whether Corneille be contemplating the

republican or the subject of a king—the hero or the politician—he abandons himself without reserve to the system, the position, or the character which he is describing, and carefully avoids all reference to general ideas that might come into conflict with the particular ideas which he is desirous of bringing upon the stage, and which vary according to the personages of the drama. This unreserved adoption of a special principle, changing with the circumstances of the piece, gained Corneille credit for great skill in representing the local colour and genius of different peoples and states; whilst this merit was denied to Racine, whose descriptions, being of a more general nature, seem too familiar to our eyes to belong, by any possibility, to other times than our own. Racine's heroes were recognised at once, and claimed as Frenchmen; but the singular physiognomy of Corneille's heroes enabled them to pass easily for Greeks or Romans. . . . The style of Corneille varied with the vicissitudes of his genius. Astonishment has been expressed at this; but there would have been more room for astonishment had it been otherwise, and had his style not remained faithful, both in good and evil fortune, to the character of his thoughts. Writing was never anything to him but the expression of his ideas; and his contemporaries attest that carefulness of style was of no avail in effects which were entirely due to the grandeur of the subjects which he had to depict. 'Corneille,' says Segrais, 'was not conscious of the beauty of his versification, and while writing he paid attention not to harmony but only to feeling.' And Chapelain informs us, that 'Corneille, who has written such noble poetry, was unacquainted with the art of versification, and it was purely nature that acted in him.' An artistic style, which, at the time when Corneille appeared, constituted almost the whole merit of a fashionable poet, had very little indeed to do with the merit of a dramatic author. Corneille introduced style into the drama by introducing thoughts; he said simply what he meant, and he therefore spoke nobly, for what he had to say was high and noble. We must not, therefore, expect to find in Corneille that poetical expression which is intended to increase the impression produced by an object, by connecting with it accessory ideas which the object would not have suggested of itself. All necessary circumstances, and these alone, he brings before our eyes, because he has seen them; he could not fail to see them in the position in which he was placed, and into that position he transfers us. This is true poetry."—*Corneille and his Times*, pp. 203-259.

This is truly superior criticism. It shows what masterly things may be said by a man of real thought in connexion with the most hackneyed subject. If anything is still wanted to complete the delineation of Corneille up to that degree of distinctness and individuality which might be necessary for the sake of the English reader, who may not know the poet from his own writings, it is partly because this additional something must have seemed too familiar to a French critic to be worth express-

ing, and partly because it could only present itself with much force to one standing clear of the associations of French poetry altogether, and disposed, therefore, not only to take note of the peculiarities of Corneille among French poets, but also to involve in his criticisms the peculiarities of French poetry itself.

Were we to define in one word the genius of Corneille, in the aspect in which it is likely to impress an English critic, we should say that it is the genius of poetic *declamation*. We mean no disparagement by this epithet; we mean very high praise. Every man has his forte. Every man has some attitude, set, position, or prescribed aim and purpose of his faculties, in accordance with which they work best. The faculties may exist in all varieties of proportions, and may show themselves in all manner of independent ways; but the man deals his best stroke, and shoots his clearest lightnings, when the faculties assume the prescribed attitude, and are provided with the appropriate set of external circumstances. Samuel Johnson was best in conversation, with Burke and Reynolds listening, and Bozzy leaning behind his chair to receive the spare knocks; Joachim Murat was best at the head of a charge of horse, when the scabbards jingled as the men dashed on, and the sun gleamed on a sea of sabres. And so also with the poet; except that in his case life does not furnish the actual, but the mind itself provides an ideal, set of circumstances. The poet Moore, for example, did his best when he wrote for those situations of life in which a light gaiety or a sentimental melancholy is sought after as a social luxury; his songs were written to be sung in well-lighted modern rooms, as one of the artificial accompaniments of a festive occasion. Horace was most sagacious when he saw himself in the company of Mæcenas and a few other such cronies of the right Epicurean sort, strolling over the fallen leaves in the walks about a country villa, or reclining *al fresco* over filberts and Falernian. "In the heart of Homer, we should suppose, the poetic glow was at its height, when he rehearsed in low and solitary recitative the strain he was to conduct as chief of the bards at some royal hall close to the murmurs of the Ægean. And so on with other poets, although it may not always be so easy to describe the characteristic group of ideal associations. Now Corneille, as it appears to us, wrote best when he fancied those situations the proper outcome of which was a measured flow of fine declamation. This, let it be observed, does not necessarily limit within any very narrow range the field of his poetic observation. Precisely as Moore, though his songs were to be sung in a London drawing-room, could bring their subjects from the East or from the wilds of Ireland; or as Horace, with all his *penchant* for the villa and the Falernian, could go

out a good way and ascend to a good height for the topics he was to bring back for the edification of himself and his guests—so in Corneille, breadth and discursiveness of imagination might very well be consistent with his special excellence in the attitude of a declaimer. The only necessary limit was that what he did imagine should be imagined in that way in which a fine declamatory effect should easily arise. And certainly there are few instances in which a poet has, with so much of real poetic vigour and variety, produced such noble passages to be uttered by a stately actor before an audience. Corneille, awkward bourgeois as he was in private life, stalks the stage in his poetry, with the majesty of a Talma; there is kingly magnificence in his look and step, and every thought and word is to correspond. His plays are full of noble speeches. As he fancied his hero or situation, he did this, as M. Guizot well says, with the most perfect distinctness of vision; the man and the juncture of circumstances stood before him insulated from all that was irrelevant or unnecessary; the feeling appropriate to the imagined moment rushed up in his soul, clear, single, and strong; and, when he gave vent to this feeling, it was in words so terse, so direct, and delivered with such weight, and even epigram, right on the intelligence, amid all their riot of passion, that Demosthenes himself could not have spoken better. M. Guizot well describes the peculiarity of Corneille's style as that of "energetic concision." We could quote example after example through many pages, but let a few suffice. What poet has furnished lines which a good actor could deliver with more electric effect, or of which an orator could more finely avail himself in his moments of highest inspiration, than such lines as these:—

"Un moment donne au sort des visages divers;
Et, dans ce grand bonheur, je crains un grand revers."

"A qui venge son père il n'est rien impossible
Ton bras est vaincu, mais non pas invincible."

"Les hommes valeureux le sont du premier coup."

"Vous parlez en soldat; je dois agir en roi."

"Un grand destin commence, un grand destin s'achève."

"Non, je ne pleure point, Madame, mais je meurs."

"Un véritable amant ne connaît point d'amis."

"Qui n'appréhende rien présume trop de soi."

“ Il est beau de mourir maître de l'univers ;
 Mais la plus belle mort souille notre mémoire,
 Quand nous avons vu vivre et croître notre gloire.”

Prusias. “ Je veux mettre d'accord l'amour et la nature,
 Être père et mari dans cette conjoncture.

Nicomède. Seigneur, voulez-vous bien vous fier à moi,
 Ne soyez l'un ni l'autre.

Prusias. Et que dois-je être ?

Nicomède. Roi !

Reprenez hautement ce noble caractère ;
 Un véritable roi n'est ni mari ni père,
 Il regarde son trône et rien de plus. Régnez !”

If the reader wants longer specimens, let him turn over the plays for himself, not forgetting to look again at such well-known passages as the famous imprecation of Camille on Rome in the *Horaces*, and the grand soliloquy of Augustus, when he discovers the conspiracy against him, in *Cinna*. There are no passages of poetical declamation in any language superior to those ; and they are but two out of hundreds.

Were we desirous to follow out this passing remark as to the special respect in which Corneille impresses an Englishman, into a farther appreciation involving the degree to which truth and greatness in poetry can be attained under such a condition of genius as that just indicated, and involving also the question of the inherent poetical capacities of a people which has furnished such a poet as its highest or nearly so, we should be able to do so best by going through all that Guizot says respecting Shakspeare, and then shewing that what he says respecting him is determined very much by those associations with the word *Poetry*, which naturally cling to a critic who is a countryman of Corneille. We have room, however, but for a very slight notice of Guizot's estimate of Shakspeare ; and, therefore, any reflex bearing which our remarks on that estimate may have on French Poetry in general, or on Corneille in particular, must be left for inference.

On the whole, England has no reason to complain of the manner in which M. Guizot has spoken of her intellectual idol. He has praised Shakspeare to the skies. The intellect, the imagination, the fancy, the wit, the humour of the English poet are all lauded again and again in language confessing its own weakness in regard to so superb an object for critical description. The epithets great, prodigious, immense, and the like, are heaped upon the dead, till, by their very plenty, they become rubbish. And if, doing all this in honour of the Teutonic poet, M. Guizot, as a Frenchman, should just stop short of the admission that he is to be regarded as the most magnificent thing, in the way of

intellect, that the world has ever seen, can we wonder at it? Even if he believed it, it would be too much to expect that he should have deliberately expressed the belief; unless, indeed, he could have appended to the volume an historical dissertation to prove that the Shakspeares of Warwickshire came originally from the neighbourhood of Paris.

But, while thus vying with Englishmen in doing justice to the magnificence of dimension and the exquisite quality of Shakspeare's genius, M. Guizot does take leave to part with us at certain points in this race of laudation, and to administer, as correctives of our idolatrous worship, certain distinct and unhesitating criticisms on the contour of the idol, and on our taste in admiring him. In other words, M. Guizot points out certain serious faults in Shakspeare as an artist. The faults are various, and they are described many times; but they seem to be summed up pretty completely in the following passages:—

Substance and Form.—"It is in the substance that Shakspeare excels, it is in the form that he fails. (*C'est par le fond que Shakspeare excelle, et par la forme qu'il pêche.*) He discerns and brings admirably into view the instincts, the passions, ideas—indeed all the inner life of man; he is the most profound and dramatic of moralists; but he makes his personages speak a language which is often fastidious, strange, excessive, and destitute of moderation and naturalness—(*recherche, étrange, excessif, depourvu de mesure et de naturel.*) And the English language is singularly propitious to the defects, as well as to the beauties of Shakspeare. It is rich, energetic, passionate, abundant, striking; it readily admits the lofty flights and even the wild excesses of the poetic imagination; but it does not possess that elegant sobriety, that severe and delicate precision, that moderation in expression, and harmony in imagery, which constitute the peculiar merit of the French language; so that when Shakspeare passes from England into France, if he is translated with scrupulous fidelity, his defects become more apparent, and more offensive, beneath his new dress, than they were in his native form; and if, on the other hand, it is attempted to adapt his language, even in the slightest degree, to the genius of our tongue, he is inevitably robbed of a great part of his wealth, force, and originality."—*Shakspeare and his Times, Preface*, pp. iv. v.

Confusion of Tragedy and Comedy.—"The Greeks, whose mind and civilisation followed so regular a course in their development, did not combine the two kinds of composition, and the distinction which separates them in nature was maintained without effort in art. Tragedy and Comedy shared man and the world between them, each taking a different domain in the region of realities, and coming by turns to offer to the serious or mirthful consideration of a people who invariably insisted on simplicity and harmony, the poetic effects which their skill could derive from the materials placed in their hands

. . . In our modern world all things have borne another character. Order, regularity, natural and easy development seem to have been banished from it. Immense interests, admirable ideas, sublime sentiments have been thrown, as it were, pell-mell with brutal passions, coarse necessities, and vulgar habits. The incoherent assemblage of all that human nature and destiny contain of that which is great and little, noble and trivial, serious and puerile, strong and wretched—this is what man and society have been in our Europe. In such a state of mind and things, how was it possible for a clear distinction and simple classification of styles and arts to be effected? How could Tragedy and Comedy have presented and formed themselves isolatedly in literature, when, in reality, they were incessantly in contact, entwined in the same facts, and intermingled in the same actions so thoroughly that it was sometimes difficult to discern the moment of passage from one to the other? Was it proposed to bring upon the stage the habitual occurrences of ordinary life? Taste was as easily satisfied as manners. Those religious performances which were the origin of the European theatre, had not escaped this admixture. The first Mysteries brought simultaneously upon the stage the emotions of religious terror and tenderness and the buffooneries of vulgar comicality: and thus in the very cradle of dramatic poetry, tragedy and comedy contracted that alliance which was inevitably forced upon them by the general condition of nations and minds. . . . In France, however, this alliance was speedily broken off. We may affirm that in France comedy, in an imperfect, but distinct form, was created before tragedy. At a later period, the rigorous separation of classes, the absence of popular institutions, the regular action of the supreme power, &c., disposed the popular mind to maintain that strict distinction between the two styles which was ordained by the classical authorities who held undisputed sway over our drama. . . . Nothing of this kind took place among the English. The asylum of German manners as well as of German liberties, England pursued without obstacle the irregular but natural course of the civilisation which such elements could not fail to engender. It retained their disorder as well as their energy; and, until the middle of the seventeenth century, its literature, as well as its institutions, was the sincere expression of these qualities. When the English drama attempted to reproduce the poetic image of the world, tragedy and comedy were not separated. . . . It is utterly futile to attempt to base any classification of Shakspeare's works on the distinction between the comic and the tragic elements; they cannot possibly be divided into these two styles, but must be separated into the fantastic and the real, the romance and the world. The first class contains most of his comedies; the second comprehends all his tragedies—immense and living stages upon which all things are represented, as it were, in their solid form, and in the place which they occupied in a stormy and complicated state of civilisation. . . . [M. Guizot then goes on to illustrate this theory of the dramatic art, and to plead for its toleration by the votaries of the stricter classic, on account of the splendid effects with which genius has consecrated it; he appears

decidedly to think, however,¹ that, in the blending of the tragic and the comic so broadly in the same play, Shakspeare has often committed offences against reason and taste under any theory, and hence he adopts as his own what follows, which is from the Essay attributed to the Duc de Broglie.] . . . The mixture of comedy and tragedy is not, or certainly ought not to be a purely arbitrary thing. Never should the contrast be allowed, unless under the condition, that the dominant impression, which is chiefly to be regarded, should be developed and not destroyed, should not be lost sight of, but rendered more lasting and profound. No one knew this better than Shakspeare, no one has illustrated it by more numerous and beautiful examples. But we confess we cannot find them in *Othello*. In this play the comic element is purely arbitrary; it is, in some sort appended to the tragic, while there is no intimate relation between the one and the other, no common aim, no alliance to be ratified by the deep experiences of the soul. Let Roderigo be eliminated from the piece—a genuine melodramatic simpleton, who only appears that he may serve as a butt to Iago, to be beduped and befooled by him: you can do so; what Roderigo does might be done quite as well by any one else; no one, Iago excepted, would know or care for his absence. Let Brabantio, the firm and prudent senator, full of ability and self-possession, dignified and respected, be true to his proper character; let him not be transformed, during two whole scenes, merely to suit the whim of the author, into a Geronte or a Sganarelle. Let Cassio fall into disgrace with his general from some more worthy motive than that supplied by taking a glass of wine at an unseasonable time. Lastly, erase entirely the part of the clown, a part so false that the French imitator, though he has in general adhered most conscientiously to the original, did not think himself bound to preserve it.”—*Shakspeare and his Times*, pp. 78-98; and pp. 316-318.

Shakspeare's chief fault.—“One misfortune happened to Shakspeare: though he was always lavish of his wealth, he was not always able to distribute it either opportunely or skilfully. This was frequently the misfortune of Corneille also. Ideas accumulated about Corneille, as about Shakspeare, confusedly and tumultuously, and neither of them had the courage to treat his own mind with prudent severity. They forgot the position of the character they were describing, in order to indulge in the thoughts which it awakened in the soul of the poet. In Shakspeare especially, this excessive indulgence in his own ideas and feelings sometimes arrests and interrupts the emotions awakened in the breast of the spectator, in a manner which is fatal to dramatic effect. It is not merely, as in Corneille, the ingenious loquacity of a rather talkative mind, but it is the restless and fantastic reverie (*l'inquiète et bizarre rêverie*) of a mind astonished at its own discoveries, not knowing how to reproduce the whole impression which it has received from them, and heaping ideas, images, and expressions, one upon another, in order to awaken in us feelings similar to those by which it is itself oppressed. . . . Hence arose the true and great fault of Shakspeare, the only one

that originated in himself, and which is sometimes perceptible even in his finest conceptions; and that is, a deceptive appearance of laborious research, (*recherche pleine d'effort*,) which is occasioned, on the contrary, by the absence of labour. Accustomed, by the taste of his age, frequently to connect ideas and expressions by their most distant relations, he contracted the habit of that learned subtlety which perceives and assimilates everything, and leaves no point of resemblance unnoticed; and this fault has more than once marred the gaiety of his comedies, as well as destroyed the pathos of his tragedies. If meditation had taught Shakspeare to fall back upon himself, to contemplate his own strength, and to concentrate it by skilful management, he would soon have rejected the abuse which he has made of it, and would have speedily become conscious that neither his heroes nor his spectators could follow him in that prodigious movement of ideas, feelings, and intentions which, on every occasion and under the slightest pretext, arose and obtruded themselves upon his own thought."—*Shakspeare and his Times*, pp. 113-116.

Now, as Thomas Aquinas has ingeniously remarked, all men are fallible. Shakspeare, we daresay, had his faults like other men, and could have written sometimes better if he had tried harder, had a French education, studied Boileau, or been quite free from headache. We are not going to defend all his *torturato* passages, every witticism of his clowns, or his errors in geography and chronology. He may, as some of his advocates hold, have had deep meanings even in his errata, though we cannot make that the subject of affidavit. But "great barbarian," "Attila-Shakspeare,"—this notion of our bard, whether in the old and unmodified shape in which Voltaire disseminated it, or in the new and more elevated, and altogether more mild and reverential sense in which the foregoing passages suggest it, we will not for a moment endure. And, in fact, to confess the truth, we would rather not have Shakspeare spoken against at all. As the old parishioner of Ettrick said to the Unitarian lecturer, who, after attacking the theology of his former pastor, began to attack his character,—“Haud aff Tammas Boston, Sir; haud aff Tammas Boston.”

After all, it is a question of races. This attempt to indicate the evidences of a supposed tinge of barbarism in the genius of Shakspeare; these assertions that the prodigious strength and abundance of mind shewn in his works, as regards substance, are accompanied by rudeness and defect as regards form; these objections to his mode of mingling the tragic and the comic, and proposals to improve his plays by omitting the Roderigos, making the Brabantios more stately, and sweeping out all the clowns; these complaints against him for an intellectual incontinence which is constantly giving people more than they want, and pouring out volumes of thought, analogy, and occult allu-

sion, if but a pane of glass breaks;—all this, we say, is nothing more than the inevitable display of what a Frenchman, as such, feels, when he contemplates the highest example of Teutonic art. No man can jump off his own shadow; and M. Guizot, as a Frenchman, is not related so truly as we are to the Pan-Teutonic poet. Yes, that is the name for Shakspeare! Germans, Danes, and Swedes, as well as Englishmen, accept him precisely as he is, admitting only those defects, incapable of being classed, which attach to all human performances. It is the Frenchman alone, or the man of French training, that can receive from Shakspeare that impression of dissatisfaction or offended taste which arises from the sight of deviations from a supposed principle. Let any one who desires to see this verified and illustrated compare Guizot's criticisms on Shakspeare with those of the German Ulrici. In Ulrici, besides general criticism of a different, and, we think, far deeper order, the reader will find exactly that kind of philosophical justification of Shakspeare's supposed faults, and especially of his confusion of the comic and the tragic, which, according to the view we now present, a German could best give. There he will find the eternal theory of Clowns, and the reason why there should be a clown present even when murder is in the wind, and a kingdom is about to crack; there he will find Roderigo's charter of existence fully made out, and a profound explanation given why, on *a priori* grounds, Cassio got drunk. Placing himself in each play at what he conceives to be the central point, the critic accepts all that issued from the poet's mind in its moment of creative energy, as belonging necessarily to that moment, and necessarily coherent throughout; and then makes it his business to do what the poet perhaps could not have done for himself, consciously dissect the separate parts, and shew their scientific relation to the whole. And thus everything in Shakspeare is reduced back to its source in the real feelings of a Teutonic mind in the act of contemplating nature.

We back the heavy Ulrici against the lighter and more lucid Guizot. We will indicate, in conclusion, our reason for doing so. It is a reason, we think, which will elevate the Teutonic adhesion to Shakspeare over the Gallic criticism of him, by shewing that, though the former as well as the latter may connect itself with prejudice of race, it can yet, if need be, exhibit a higher sanction in fact and science. If what we shall say should seem to revive the memory of the old and tiresome controversy between Classicism and Romanticism, we cannot help that.

Europe, then, seems to us to have had, in the widest sense, only two Literatures; which are, in fact, also, (if we omit one Eastern Literature of immense and peculiar significance,) the only great Literatures that have been in the world. These are—the Southern or Græco-Latin Literature, of which we here

account the modern Italian, the French, and the Spanish as separate, though not wholly pure, continuations; and the Northern or Teutonic Literature, of which the English, the German, and the Scandinavian Literatures are branches. There is a difference of spirit between these two Literatures, and this difference of spirit is best seen by a comparison of the master-pieces of poetic creation that have illustrated each. First came the Greek, casting *his* poetic eye over the appearances of life and nature. In him the imagination, that faculty or that use of the faculties which in all languages is set apart as most properly the requisite of the poet, existed in the highest conceivable degree; but if we inquire more particularly as to the manner or style in which this imagination of the Greek worked, we shall find that it delighted above all in setting forth images of concrete things in clear shape and outline, with the least possible efflux, while doing so, of the matter secreted in the mind itself during the intellectual act. The grandest examples of this are the poems of Homer, *Æschylus*, and *Sophocles*; the comparative dissatisfaction of the critics with the third tragic poet, *Euripides*, arising in a great degree from the fact that he was not so purely a Greek in this respect. From the Greeks the literary sovereignty passed on to the Romans; who, with feebler powers of genuine imagination, produced, in *Virgil* and others, new masters in the same essential style. Even the revolution of the ancient world by the Christian theology, and the addition of a considerable leaven of the Teutonic element to the society of the southern and central nations of Europe, did not overcome the classic method of art where it had taken possession. In Dante, mediæval Italy produced a man greater in force of imagination than any ancient Roman, and whose imagination yet worked in the true southern manner, the clear and rigorous definition of the concrete. Spain, whose greatest man of letters was *Cervantes*, expended what was left of her, after the deduction of his genius, in dramas bearing marks of her Latin lineage. The French, whose claim to be a more imaginative people than the cold and mercantile English is founded on an incorrigible mistake as to what imagination is, have exhibited their deficiency in creative genius in the fact that, with so many intellectual magnates of the first rank in other departments, they have not produced one poet so great that the rest of the world will call him great. The man of greatest creative genius, in the true sense, that France has produced, is neither *Corneille* nor *Racine*, but that wild compound of filth and flashing insight—*Rabelais*. Now both in *Cervantes* and in *Rabelais* there is discernible a species of imagination not discernible in either the Spanish or the French dramatists—suggesting that there was a new spirit at work in modern European Literature. This spirit is seen most purely,

however, in its native and original home, the Literature of the Teutonic nations. Since the Greek, the Teuton was the first man who came upon the world so situated, that he could take absolutely his own way in thinking of it. As unlike the Greek as the clear skies and vineyards of the warmer are unlike the sea-mists and forests of the colder latitudes, this Adam of the north gazed on life and nature, in the full faith of his rich and complex instincts, unawed by Homer, and untaught by Aristotle. Out of the activity of this new power applied to the same everlasting materials has sprung the Literature of the Teutonic nations, of which Shakspeare is the acknowledged prince. Slowly evolved by its own efforts, and even largely affected by the influence of the classic upon it during its evolution, this Literature has still maintained its indigenous character, and has exhibited that character most of all in its specimens of poetic art. And in what does this character consist? It consists in more of melancholy, more of humour, more of mysticism, more of reverent forth-going upon the minutiae and smaller pulsations as well as upon the massive objects and larger processes of nature and life; and above all, if indeed this does not include all, in more of the reflective, inquisitive, and discursive spirit at all times and occasions--more of the tendency to pour out, in the act of imagining a thing, all the purely intellectual *secretion* of the moment, so as, by this very suffusion of self upon the outward, to complicate the relation between nature and man. This is that very spirit of *recherche* to which Guizot objects in Shakspeare. Shakspeare could not reach forth his hand to touch a mental object before him but the whole intervening space of atmosphere fell down in flakes of thought. He reached the object, nevertheless; and the imaginative act was none the less real, none the less natural and artist-like, for the rich intellectual precipitation which accompanied it. It was no tinge of barbarism, therefore, in Shakspeare that led him to that confusion of the comic and tragic, and that excess and waste of intellectualism, for which he has been called in question. It was but his greatness as a practitioner in the Teutonic form of art—a form different from the older form, but as legitimate. Nay, and that this Teutonic form of art is now to be regarded as the superior, ought, we think, to be clear from the fact, that it is the later; from the fact, that it appreciates and recognises, and can even practise the other, while the other objects to and cannot practise *it*; from the fact, that it has already so far superseded the other by its greater accordance with the spirit and circumstances of modern humanity; and from the fact, that the race to whom it is native, being masters of the greatest portion of the Earth physically, would have the right of appointing, even if they could not supply, the Earth's intellectual king.

- ART. V.—1. *A History of the Hebrew Monarchy.* By FRANCIS W. NEWMAN. London, Chapman, 1847.
2. *The Creed of Christendom: its Foundation and Superstructure.* By WILLIAM RATHBONE GREG. London, Chapman, 1851.
3. *A Lecture on the Historic Evidence of the Authorship and Transmission of the Books of the New Testament.* By S. P. TREGELLES, LL.D. London, Bagster, 1852.
4. *The Restoration of Belief.* Parts I. and II. Cambridge, Macmillan, 1852.
5. *Der Christliche Glaube.* Von Dr. FRIEDRICH SCHLEIERMACHER. 2 Bände. Berlin, 1822.
6. *Geschichte der Pflanzung und Leitung der Christlichen Kirche durch die Apostel.* Von Dr. AUGUST NEANDER. 2^{ter} Band. Hamburg, Perthes, 1833.
7. *System der Christlichen Lehre.* Von Dr. CARL IMMANUEL NITZSCH. 5^{te} Auflage. Bonn, 1844.
8. *Das Leben Jesu Christi.* Von Dr. AUGUST NEANDER. 4^{te} Auflage. Hamburg, 1845.
9. *Deutsche Zeitschrift für Christliche Wissenschaft und Christliches Leben.* Nos. 16, 17, 18, 42, 43, 44,—1850. *Die Inspirations-Lehre.* Von Dr. A. THOLUCK. No. 50,—1850. *Die Schule von Genf. Eine Berichtigung.* Von Prof. Dr. MERLE D'AUBIGNE. No. 21,—1851. *Ueber Inspiration Eine Entgegnung.* Von Dr. RUDOLF STIER. Berlin, Wiegandt und Grieben.
10. *La Critique et La Foi.* Deux Lettres. Par EDMOND SCHERER. Paris, Ducloux, 1850.
11. *The Doctrine of Plenary Inspiration; and the Errors of M. Scherer of Geneva.* By Count AGENOR DE GASPARIN. Translated by the Rev. J. MONTGOMERY, A.M. Edinburgh, Johnstone and Hunter, 1852.
12. *Die Reden des Herrn Jesu.* Von RUDOLF STIER. 1^{ter} Band. 2^{te} Auflage. Barmen, 1852. 2^{te}–6^{te} Band. 1844–48. 1^{te} Auflage.
13. *Theologische Studien und Kritiken.* *Das Wesen des Christenthums und die Mystik.* Von Dr. CARL ULLMANN. Hamburg, Perthes, 1852. 3^{ter} Heft.
14. *Confessions of an Inquiring Spirit.* By S. T. COLERIDGE. London, Pickering, 1849.
15. *The Philosophy of Religion.* By J. D. MORELL, A.M. London, Longman, 1849.
16. *Inspiration in Conflict with Recent Forms of Philosophy and Scepticism.* A Lecture by JOHN EADIE, D.D. 2d Edition. Edinburgh, Oliphant, 1849.
17. *The Authority and Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures.* A

- Lecture by the Rev. R. S. CANDLISH, D.D. London, Nisbet, 1851.
18. *A Lecture on the Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures, delivered at the Opening of the New College, London.* By J. HARRIS, D.D. London, Jackson and Walford, 1851.
 19. *The Elements of the Gospel Harmony.* By BROOKE FOSS WESTCOTT, Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. Cambridge, Macmillan, 1851.
 20. *Theopneustie : ou Inspiration Plenièrre des Saintes Ecritures.* Par L. GAUSSEN. 2^{me} Edition. Paris, Delay, 1842.

THE orthodoxy of our fathers, amid many minor diversities and modifications, held fast to *three* propositions on the subject of our Sacred Books: *First*, That they embody a Divine Revelation; *Secondly*, That they exhaust that Revelation; and, *Thirdly*, That they contain it in a form of absolute purity.

To these three propositions—as unimpaired by all recent attacks, and as alike superior to the menace of foes and the indecisive apologies of friends—we give in our cordial adhesion, and count it no shame, but a signal felicity and honour, with the evidence which lies before us, to hold up our every-day Bible, beginning with Genesis and ending with Revelation, as the genuine and infallible Word of God. It is a cheap and easy thing to defend this belief, on the ground of mere tradition, and to repel every sceptical questioning of revelation, every insinuation against the integrity of the canon of Scripture, every suspicion of the infallible accuracy of our Biblical records, as in itself profane and blasphemous. Such a homage to the infallibility of the Bible would itself require a personal inspiration to redeem it from presumption and wilful blindness. An admissible protest in behalf of the Bible implies something like extensive and close inquiry; and while no one can pretend to have exhausted every argument, tested every fact, and weighed every difficulty in connexion with a body of documents so voluminous and so enveloped in the dust of controversy, nothing less goes to such a confession of faith than the honest conviction, gathered from the study of all sides of the question, that the long venerated doctrine of the infallibility of the Bible has not been appreciably weakened at any point by all the freedom of recent speculation, or the results of modern historical and critical investigation. It is our present purpose, without entering into an abstract and independent discussion of the subject of Inspiration, to examine the claims and pretensions of some leading theories, both British and Continental; and to indicate, not in the way of chronological development, but of moral grouping, the different bearings of the principal views that have lately occupied and disturbed not only our own country, but likewise Germany,

Switzerland, and France. Such a bird's-eye view, however hastily executed, may perhaps throw some light on the position and prospects of Christianity at the present day, and shew, on the one hand, how certain the infallibility of the Bible is, as a matter of historical evidence, and more especially how, on the other hand, recent departures from it end in inconsistencies with themselves, and with those admitted principles of judgment that must determine all questions of fact, whether of a natural or supernatural character.

One of the new phases of the controversy respecting Inspiration is, that it has ceased to be a controversy among the orthodox. Till our own days those opposed to Christianity as a supernatural revelation disclaimed the use of such words as Inspiration in their nomenclature, and denounced the whole idea which they embody, as mystical and superstitious. Latterly, however, it has become quite the fashion, as all the world knows, for the successors of the sceptical writers of last century to deal largely in confessions of faith respecting the Bible, which include the doctrine of its inspiration, and almost to outbid the orthodox in their eulogies upon the divine afflatus by which it was produced. The school of Parker, Newman, and Greg, afford the most singular examples of this innovation.* Mr. Greg, whose critical accuracy on such a question is, we must say, not of the highest, as is indicated by his confounding in the first page of his "Creed of Christendom," the *plenary* with its ancient opposite the *verbal* inspiration of the Scriptures, stoutly contends that the unorthodox use of inspiration is as correct as the other, and that the theologians have perverted the word from its original application in order to baptize their own dogma; nay more, that having had the inspiration of the Bible conceded in the one sense, they have, too often dishonestly, taken advantage of the ambiguity of language to give it currency in its rigid dogmatic form. What, then, is the true inspiration of the Bible which these writers have rescued out of the hands of Jewish Rabbis and Christian Schoolmen, and restored to its ancient simplicity? According to Mr. Greg, "it is that elevation of all the spiritual faculties by the action of God upon the heart, which is shared by all devout minds, though in different degrees, and which is consistent with infinite error." (P. 22.) Or, as he elsewhere expresses it, "Every great and good man possesses some portion of God's truth to proclaim to the world and to fructify in his own bosom. In a true and simple, but not the orthodox sense, we believe all the pure, wise, and mighty in soul, to be inspired, and to be inspired for the instruction, advancement, and elevation of

* We introduce the works of Mr. Newman and Mr. Greg in this article, though these were formerly considered in this Journal in connexion with a different question. (See *North British Review*, No. XXXI.)

mankind." (P. 235.) He also quotes Mr. Parker with approbation, who in his usual rhetorical style thus writes, "Inspiration is the consequence of a faithful use of our faculties. Each man is its subject; God its source; truth its only test. Men may call it miraculous, but nothing is more natural. It is co-extensive with the faithful use of man's natural powers. Now, this inspiration is limited to no sect, age, or nation. It is wide as the world, and common as God. It is not given to a few men in the infancy of the world to monopolize inspiration, and bar God out of the soul." (P. 236.)

This liberal theory, it is apparent, identifies inspiration with elevated genius, and regards the Bible as nothing more than the fruit of the religious organization of its writers. The connexion of God with such inspiration of the Bible is moreover the same with his originating influence in all products of mental greatness. "When it is his will," Mr. Greg seems to say, "that mankind should make some great step forward, should achieve some pregnant discovery, he calls into being some cerebral organization of more than ordinary magnitude and power, as that of David, Isaiah, Plato, Shakspeare, Bacon, Newton, Luther, Pascal, which gives birth to new ideas and grander conceptions of the truths vital to humanity." (P. 226.) According to this view, the Bible is the highest product of man's natural religious faculties operating with peculiar advantage in the most favourable periods of Old Testament history, and more especially in the person of Jesus of Nazareth, who, partly by native endowment, and partly by happy selection from pre-existing materials, over-topped all religionists before and since, and even became, as Mr. Parker has expressed it, "the possibility of the race made real."

We will not be uncandid enough to charge the adherents of this, which may be called the theory of NATURAL INSPIRATION, with intentional abuse of language, or with a too great readiness to blunt the edge of popular prejudice, by conceding to the Scriptures an inspiration in words which is denied in reality. Mr. Greg especially is absolved from any such charge, as, however inconsistent it may seem with the passage in his work already referred to, he applies the word Inspiration to this natural power of genius somewhat reluctantly, and seems willing to leave both the name and thing in the ancient sense to less intrepid thinkers than himself. Only, as this theory has of late made considerable noise by its virtual coincidence with the speculations or ejaculations of Mr. Carlyle—as it nearly takes up the ground on which almost all German rationalists, from Paulus to Strauss, are at one—and as it seems to have absorbed the theology of the Unitarian community in this country, if not in America, to the denial of anything special and positive in the mission of Jesus, according to the antiquated views of Priestley and Channing, we

may be excused for making some passing observations upon it, though, strictly speaking, it is not so much a theory of inspiration as a negation of the fact. We shall confine ourselves to an expression of complaint as to the style in which the arguments of the orthodox* in favour of positive revelation are got rid of, and of wonder at the results which are brought out by the new system.

It may be made a preliminary matter of complaint that these writers profess to weigh and canvass at all the alleged evidence of revelation, *as a supernatural system embodied in writings*, as if the evidence offered were admissible, while at the same time they have made up their minds that *no* argument can establish *any* miracle or supernatural communication. These advocates of an inspiration which Hobbes and Bolingbroke would have scouted as visionary, have adopted apparently a doctrine of the abstract impossibility of a miraculous revelation from which the writers we have named would have shrunk as rash and unphilosophical. Wherever Mr. Newman alights on a miracle, it is forthwith, as *in itself* incredible, resolved into a myth, and Mr. Greg has expended pages of logic to prove, what certainly is not self-evident, that the faculty to *comprehend* a revelation implies the faculty, sooner or later, to *make* it; and hence, that a discovery truly supernatural is absolutely impossible. (Pp. 230-233.) To us, it seems hardly necessary to illustrate the fallacy, not to say absurdity of this doctrine. Were a person to predict the return of Sir John Franklin's ships upon a certain day of next year, and to follow up the prediction by an account of the form of government in France and the name of the chief governor in 1872, would Mr. Greg maintain that the power to comprehend the latter prediction implied the power to make it, and that the power to believe it, after the first was verified, brought it within the range of discoverable truths. Be the evidence of supernatural revelation in the Bible sufficient or insufficient, it is surely not fair to make a profession of candour in weighing it, and to lament the hard necessity of rejecting it on account of its imperfections, when the very gate of evidence is barred by such preconceptions. Instead of leading us through a long blind alley of *critical* objections to the divinity of the Pentateuch and the Gospels, it would be better to write up at once—"No thoroughfare." Whole treatises, like De Wette's Introduction and Strauss' Leben Jesu would then be superseded by a few strokes of natural metaphysics; or, if criticism were at all superadded, the grave deduction which must be made in all moral questions from the arguments of the reasoner, who is thus bound to find for only one side, would be at once apparent and easy.

* We use the term "orthodox" purely for the sake of distinction; and can intend no arrogance by adopting a designation which has been of late so lightly spoken of.

Another ground of complaint is, that the internal evidence of the Bible for its own inspiration in the orthodox sense, is not only suppressed, but turned the other way, by an obstinate misreading of its contents. Denying, setting aside, and even sneering at everything preternatural in the Old Testament, Mr. Newman, in his "History of the Hebrew Monarchy," still attempts to construct the facts, after all their high and glorious motives have been withdrawn. Nothing is left for him, rejecting the entire Mosaic groundwork of the Jewish system, but to write down the succeeding history as a succession of feuds, massacres, and impostures, with only occasional gleams of natural piety and elevated fanaticism to gild the darkness. Having disenchanting the Old Testament of its theocracy, it is easy to expose its narratives to the critical scalping-knife. *The living voice of God was the grand justification of the entire system.* It is the same with the history of Christians still. It is either sublime or it is ridiculous. And an exact parallel to Mr. Newman's "history" of the Old Testament kings and prophets would be found in a biography of a great spirit, such as Luther or Whitefield, in which every superhuman influence was denied, and the remaining phenomena set down to the account of vanity, obstinacy, and self-will, with a sufficient admixture of eccentric benevolence and enthusiasm to give the portrait some faint resemblance. Mr. Greg, too, removing the miraculous foundation of the New Testament system, necessarily stumbles at a thousand points in the life of our Saviour and his disciples, abolishes altogether the grand coherent features in the image of "God manifest in the flesh," stigmatizes as bigotry and arrogance the decisive and imperial style which must belong to a divine communication, explains the gift of tongues as madness, and the self-sacrificing and world-renouncing spirit of the primitive Church as due only to a frenzied expectation of the end of all things; and in short, having reduced the doctrine of Jesus to the elements of natural religion, and himself to the most gifted of mere human teachers, is compelled to search among the baser tendencies of human nature to account for that appearance of inflation, pomposity, and convulsive excitement, amid which Christianity was ushered into the world.

But the most serious ground of complaint of all is to be found in the unauthorized and arbitrary manner in which these advocates of natural inspiration set aside the positive external evidence of the Bible, that they may at once bring it down to their own standard. The very strength of the orthodox doctrine lies in the proof that the Old Testament, and later records, were contemporaneous or immediately subsequent to the events which they chronicle. The reception of the books is thus a guarantee for the facts, miraculous as they are, and these miraculous facts

in turn accredit the professed inspiration of the writers. This, so far from being a circle, as has been sometimes inconsiderately represented, is a strong chain of linked demonstration, which no efforts of Naturalism can ever break asunder. Hence, with instinctive recoil from the neighbourhood of the supernatural, the whole company of rationalist critics, among whom are first those of Germany, arbitrarily wrest and torture every sacred writing out of its place, and separate it by an interval from its subject, so adjusting it anew, that the supernatural inference shall be impossible; by a curious law not sufficiently adverted to, making the event repel the history, and attract the prophecy of itself. The result is those singular dislocations, transpositions, and shiftings of the sacred books from their ancient moorings by whole centuries, in regard to which no German critic is at one with his brother, but all agree that no book must be landed beneath the shadow of a miracle, or at a distance from the fulfilment of any prophecy. This play of German intellect with the Pentateuch, the Isaian prophecies, and the gospels, utterly discordant in everything but the *πρωτον ψευδος* of the system, forms a melancholy chapter in the aberrations of human learning, and on a question of purely literary criticism, would not have been tolerated. As it is, in a country where every scholar is tempted to fight his way by paradoxes, where extravagant scepticism alternates with blind credulity as almost a part of the national character, where the sense of the supernatural has (or rather *had*) to a mournful extent died out, and the public mind is untrained by any rigid institutional discipline in the examination of evidence, such tendencies have become epidemic to deny every scriptural book to its reputed author, and to push every document from its traditional seat. A few supposed traces of a later style—a handful of anachronisms easily explicable on the supposition of a revisal—the very prophecies themselves which it contains, have been eagerly laid hold of to thrust down the Pentateuch to the last ages of the Jewish monarchy. The consenting tradition of the Jews, enhanced by their scrupulous care of their sacred books, and their critical skill, too, as shewn in the rejection of the Old Testament Apocrypha—the accordant testimony of the most ancient memorials, such as the passover—the stones of Gilgal—the brazen serpent—and many others, which no rationalism ventures to assign to so late an origin as the supposititious date in question—the independent existence of the Samaritan Pentateuch—the corroborations of profane history, and the voice of the monuments of Egypt, to say nothing of the beautiful continuity of the grave and majestic narrative itself, all go for nothing with critics like De Wette, who can cut up the history of the deluge into separate and ill-adjusted strata, and coolly dissect the story of Joseph and his brethren into

incongruous portions, clumsily pieced together, by a recent artist. In this school of historical criticism, both Mr. Newman and Mr. Greg are catechumens, looking up with profound reverence to the "science" of its masters, and adopting their negative conclusions and paradoxes, as if they never had been contradicted or refuted.*

Mr. Newman, for example, regards it as demonstrated that the Pentateuch first received a collective existence in the reign of Josiah, and that the book of Deuteronomy having been then forged by Hilkiah the priest, to uphold Levitical influence, and as a *coup d'état* against the "high places" and their adherents, was palmed on the young king as the autograph of Moses discovered in the temple. The intrinsic credibility of this origin, any competent judge of the melting pathos and sublime moral tone of Deuteronomy (for which, however, Mr. Newman has a singular contempt) may pronounce upon. Mr. Newman reasons that if Deuteronomy had existed the people could not so grievously have disobeyed its precepts, an argument of the same kind as that which

* To one at all read in German criticism, its best contradiction is furnished by itself. As an example of that "concordia discors" which annuls itself, we may quote the terms in which Ewald, the "magnus Apollo" of Mr. Newman, speaks of De Wette, the admired of Mr. Theodore Parker and Mr. Greg. In his epilogue to his work on the Poetical Books of the Old Testament, Ewald, after a high eulogium on his own Commentary on the Psalms, thus delivers himself in reply to some hostile criticism of his rival. "How has De Wette received this work which first appeared in 1835? The pen is ready to drop from my hands, when I call up the full imago of the miserable half-and-half style of criticism, so replete with crudity and vanity, and the views at once stale, confused, and groundless, which he there propounds. As he does not understand that most important psalm, the 51st, he does not scruple to call the right interpretation an immoral one, thus degrading the sacred writer himself. Was he restrained by no scruple, no doubt, no blush of shame? Did it not occur to such a universal doubter to doubt whether he was just in his strictures on others? And if his critical procedure, which is a mere compound of superficial scepticism and pretended accuracy, was perhaps explicable if not excusable in 1806, (for to real worth and fruitfulness it has never had any great claim,) how does he not perceive that its day is gone by, and that Old Testament science has long left it in the rear?" Amidst a good deal more to the same purpose, it is charged on De Wette that his method is the true cause of the decline and fall of "science" in interpretation; that he "stands stock-still in the midst of that confusion and scepticism of his which separate him from truth, and cannot penetrate or even approach the sanctuary, and loses his temper when others refuse to stay with him in darkness." "His earlier writings," it is stated, "are not without some good views, though often very confused, and even his Introduction to the Old Testament is a completely unsatisfactory book." This is wound up by the declaration of Ewald, that though he had been prevailed on to look for an hour or two into the last edition of De Wette's Commentary on the Psalms only by the solicitation of a friend, he could prove every charge by a superfluity of evidence. Squabbles like these, making every abatement for temper, are worthy of consideration in some quarters. The list of fundamental diversities among the masters of "critical science," might be indefinitely enlarged. It seems that the *odium theologicum* is not limited by the circle of orthodoxy; and that the flagellates of Germany are by their own shewing not incapable of what Mr. Greg calls "clerical reasoning." It is creditable, however, to De Wette, as we learn from Lücke's "Reminiscences," that he repaid these taunts with kindness.

would prove the non-existence of our British Statutes from the mass of national crime, or make out that our Protestant Bible was forged at the time of the Reformation, because so much existed till then in the teeth of its prohibitions. It is also contended that the young king's ignorance of the book proved its non-existence; but it is not stated in the record that he was absolutely ignorant of it, and his profound emotion on the discovery may be reasonably explained by the presence of a document so venerable and awful. We cannot enter, however, into details of this kind. Enough may be found in the works of Hengstenberg and Havernick, not to mention others, to dissipate this and kindred theories. Of these works, however, and similar fair and learned replies to German and British assaults on the Pentateuch, we should infer Mr. Newman to be ignorant, were we willing to reason on his own principles—that whatever is not mentioned where it might be expected, is not known to have any existence.

Mr. Greg fully coincides with the masterly arguments of his precursor in regard to the Old Testament, and while lamenting that so great and distressing a work should have been laid upon him, he is yet prepared, relying on the impregnable science of De Wette and Strauss, to unsettle the "creed of christendom," respecting the authenticity and inspiration of the gospels. We are compelled loudly to protest against every step of his argumentation, and, looking to the tokens of haste and deficient consideration too frequently visible in a work of so grave a nature, sincerely hope that such a style of criticism may long remain an exotic on English soil. The Gospel of Matthew, though supported by unbroken tradition from the end of the first century, and read, according to undeniable evidence, from the beginning, as one of four gospels, in all Christian assemblies, is denied to be his, chiefly on the ground (internal evidence apart) of the subordinate difference as to whether it was written in Greek or Hebrew; as if the consent of the Church to receive a gospel as his, and to read it under that character, did not make it perfectly indifferent in respect of its testimony in what language it was written, or whether we have the original or a translation. The same singular paralogism appears in discrediting the two other synoptical gospels, because we cannot trace them to their sources, or explain their relation to each other; as if a compiler collecting many accounts of eye-witnesses were necessarily less accurate than these eye-witnesses, and that even though his narratives in turn were vouched for and pushed into currency by their exertions, as was certainly the case with the Gospels of Mark and Luke. Doubt is cast on the testimony of Papias to the Gospel of Mark, as the work of the companion of Peter, (p. 84,) because, as is the wonted cry, Papias was a man of weak mind, and because, as Dr. Middleton tells us, Irenaeus

makes Papias a disciple of John the Apostle, whereas Eusebius styles him a disciple of John the Presbyter; as if it required strong mind to vouch for a literary work, as Mr. Greg, for example, does for that of Middleton, or as if Mr. Greg's certificate to Dr. Middleton might be disputed, because two other people happened, in writing about himself, to disagree as to the place of the publication of his book, whether it was London or Manchester. The most inexcusable, however, of Mr. Greg's criticisms on the genuineness of the gospels, is on that of John. There is not a single external argument to invalidate this time-hallowed authorship. The observation of Olshausen is strictly true, that the Gospel of John is the best attested book in the whole world. Manuscripts, ancient versions, fathers, heretics like Valentinus, unbelievers like Celsus, *pleno ore* attest it. Bretschneider was about the first, thirty years ago, to assail its genuineness on internal grounds in his "*Probabilia de evangelii et epistolarum Joannis apostoli indole et origine.*" The weight of counter evidence compelled him, much to his honour, speedily to retract his positions; and it were to have been wished that Strauss who took up the forlorn hope thus deserted, but who was obliged too to abandon it, though to the manifest destruction of his favourite mythical theory, had remained steadfast in his conversion for once, if not to reason, at least to forbearance. Even De Wette, strongly tempted as he was by constitutional temperament to yield to the arguments of Strauss, a temperament which led him to sacrifice everything which had once been bitten by any rabid tooth of scepticism, was constrained to stand on the defensive, and to affirm "that the recognition of the Johannine origin of this gospel, even after the most violent attacks of recent times, will ever remain the current belief of the Church."⁴ In these circumstances, the procedure of Mr. Greg is instructive. He sets down the arguments of Bretschneider as almost decisive, being probably ignorant of his retraction, and then balancing against each other the sole authorities of De Wette and Strauss, (of whom, in regard to this gospel, he freely speaks as the "best critics," "the most eminent critics," to the exclusion of all others,) he coolly adds, "where such men doubt, assuredly it is not for us to dogmatize." Then finding the Gospel of John different from what he imagined it should have been, or ought to have been, and indulging in various other censures of the writer, he comes to the conclusion, that "if it was the work of an apostle at all, it was of an apostle who had only caught a small fragment of his Master's mantle," (p. 145,) "if it were the production of the Apostle John, it was written at a time when either from defect of memory, redundancy of imagination, or laxity in his notions

* *Kurze Erklärung des Evangeliums Johannis*, p. 8.

of an historian's duty, he allowed himself to take strange liberties with fact," (p. 210.) Thus Mr. Greg has two strings to his bow. Either way the gospel must be discredited. If its genuineness cannot be overthrown, its authority must be written down, because it does not suit his own ideas of apostolic wisdom. But it is not our question at present, how the gospels, and this among them, may be vindicated in respect of their contents. Neither is it needful to ask why Mr. Greg should on this subject, as in several other places, openly contradict himself, by assigning the first epistle to John, and asserting it as highly probable that the gospel and epistle had the same origin. If the genuineness of the gospels remains untouched, no license of censure, founded on their contents, can ever prevail against them. The only reasonable inference, in such circumstances, must be that men are against the gospels, because the gospels are against their favourite opinions. We shall therefore pass over the muster roll of discrepancies, incoherences, blunders, fictions, and even forgeries, (Mr. Greg absolves the synoptists from "want of honesty" only "in the great majority of instances," (p. 137,) and speaks of the fourth gospel as "throughout an unscrupulous and most inexact paraphrase of Christ's teaching,"—p. 157,) with which the evangelists are alleged to have dishonoured themselves and disgraced their Master. Nor shall we be tempted to discuss Mr. Greg's singular comments upon the evangelic narratives of the Resurrection. He appears to believe no more than that a young man appeared in white, who pointed out to the women the Saviour's empty tomb. This he believes, because the Gospel of Mark, which ought to end (though no critical Greek Testament makes it end) with the 8th verse of the 16th chapter, has asserted no more, and the narratives disagree on all other points. The excited imaginations of the Apostles, ready to receive anything so joyful, (though Mr. Greg elsewhere contends that the Saviour had not given them the least hint he should rise again,) "mistook some passing individual for their crucified Lord, and from such an origin multiplied rumours of his reappearance arose and spread," (p. 217.) Mr. Greg does not definitively adopt this opinion; but he regards it with no disfavour, and it seems to be the best that he can propose. This shows at least that the orthodox have not the monopoly of faith; and that those who regard this view with favour have little reason to apologize for the disciples, as "not men of critical, inquiring, or doubting minds," (p. 218.) We thought that there had been a Thomas among them, and that they were all slow to believe. We thought that there had been a whole legion of unbelievers in Jerusalem where the resurrection was immediately preached, and preached so as to imply a charge of murder, ready to put the figment down by unmasking the young man in white, or ex-

posing the Saviour's dead body. We thought that, upon the testimony of Paul, which Mr. Greg himself cannot reject, there were 500 persons, many of them still living, who saw the Saviour at one time. All this goes for nothing, unless some original document, containing the written testimony, it is now said of two, now of four, and now of at least six witnesses, is handed down from age to age, attesting a personal vision; though it might, one would think, appear, that the testimony of John in the 20th chapter of his gospel, which includes other ten, and the manifold other testimonies, are virtually not less present to us than if we heard them with our own ears. And thus with the most relentless rigour in testing history and the most charitable laxity in constructing hypotheses, the resurrection of Jesus, the watchword of sternly sincere and intensely practical men, the fact which, proclaimed in broad-day light with trumpet clearness and vindicated against all comers at the expense of the dearest life's-blood, overturned two mighty religions and revolutionized the world, vanishes away into a white mist, an apparition of the dawn which must now sink back into darkness.

Having thus freely expressed our dissatisfaction with the grounds on which this "critical" school dismisses and casts aside the old supernaturalist views of inspiration, we may be pardoned some expression of astonishment at the style in which they develop their own. The highest utterances of God in man—such products of genius as mark the culminating point of the religious instincts and faculties of our race—might expect to be treated with something of the kneeling veneration with which the worshippers of Homer, Plato, Raphael, and Handel approach their masterpieces. It is with a grievous surprise that we encounter in this class of writings an unaccountable want of respect towards these highest products of "the religious consciousness," and even a frequent sarcastic stroke, as if their authors could not forget the old grudge they had borne against them when they did battle on the orthodox side. They seem to have known the Bible so much as a foe in its supernatural form, that when it is converted to Naturalism they can hardly treat it as a friend. Mr. Newman's book is a grand corrective of Old Testament prejudices, bigotries, and religious illusions—such an account of Jewish men and things, as a Carthaginian might have written of the Roman heroes of the second Punic war. It is a reopening of the issue between David and the heathen chiefs, the kings of Judah and the kings of Israel, Hezekiah and Sennacherib, with the fixed result of reversing every verdict of the Jewish books, and bringing off the culprits not guilty.* It is a general jail-

* The same must be said of the Hebrew estimate of Samuel *versus* Saul, which Mr. Newman would reverse if the facts bearing against Samuel were not arbitrarily set aside.

delivery of Old Testament criminals—such as Jeroboam, Ahab, Ahaz; and even Jezebel, Athaliah, and Manasseh come in for redeeming words, and charitable sympathies. Such a seeking out of the neglected and remembering of the forgotten, such a circumnavigation of philanthropy has not been known for many a day. The exaltation of the one side is naturally followed by the depression of the other. The prophets are the troublers of Israel, the authors by their stupidity, if not their villany, of every great crime and massacre, and of the rupture of the kingdoms. The true, or reputedly true, are much on a level with the false, for some, like Elisha, are movers of rebellion, and others, like Jeremiah, “play into the hands of the public enemy,” (p. 352,) while all alike, if not charlatans, are enthusiasts, consecrating their own fancies by a “thus saith the Lord;” and as for the priests and Levites, like every other clerical body, their aim is power and pelf, to attain which they do not scruple to hoodwink tender-hearted kings by inventing oracles and forging books in the name of Moses. Every eulogy has some reservation; every compliment some sting in its tail. Of David we are told, that all the “brilliancy alike of his chivalry and of his piety is sullied, and cold minds suspect his religious raptures of hypocrisy,” (p. 112.) The prophets, from Joel to Isaiah, are only lauded at the expense of their successors. Isaiah’s usual strain is “grandiloquent,” and of his confessedly splendid prophecy against Sennacherib, it is condescendingly remarked, that “we *still* read it with interest and admiration,” (pp. 278, 300.) Still, “his natural note” was “harsh,” and up to his “swan-song” the oracle respecting Egypt, “when his bosom expanded to embrace Gentile enemies,” he had “the contracted heart of a mere Jew,” (p. 308.) And this is the nation—these its noblest spirits—these the masterpieces of its literature, towards which Mr. Newman, resuming the attitude of worship in the peroration of his book, tells us that “Judea was the well-spring of religious wisdom to a world besotted by frivolous or impure fancies”—that as “to the Greeks it was given to develop beauty and science—to the Romans jurisprudence and municipal rule, so to the Jews it was given to develop the holiness of God, and his sympathy towards his chosen servants,” and that while the prophets “groaned over the monstrous fictions which imposed on the nations under the name of religion, they announced that out of Zion should go forth the law and the word of Jehovah,” (p. 370.) Whence then Mr. Newman’s systematic and even ludicrous depreciation in detail of this Jewish inspiration? Judea was the well-spring of religious wisdom: yet Jewish judgments of almost everything need to be reversed. They developed the holiness of God and his sympathy with his chosen servants: but this holiness they dishonoured by odious immoralities, and their idea that they were God’s chosen

servants was mere bigotry and delusion. The prophets groaned over the fictions which imposed on the nations; yet from Samuel downward, who pretended a divine commission for the anointing of Saul, which in his heart he disliked, they too often lied and forged oracles to impose upon their own. Does Mr. Newman not see the intellectual obliquity of this procedure? Does he not see that while dilating on and exaggerating discrepancies in the books of Kings and Chronicles, his own book is a stupendous contradiction? The ribaldry of Paine itself is a relief, logically speaking, compared with this combination of kissing and smiting under the fifth rib. Nor will the English mind endure to have the record of mingled delusion and knavery, wrong-headedness and cruelty, which Mr. Newman's reading of Jewish history exhibits, decorated with the frontispiece of a temple, and the blazonry of inspiration.

Similar criticisms are made by Mr. Greg upon the persons and books of the New Testament, wherein, conjointly or severally, some kind of inspiration is notwithstanding allowed by him to reside. The style in which the evangelists are handled we have already remarked. The apostles fare no better. They had "angry contentions" among themselves, (p. 164.) They were the dupes of the prevailing delusion that the Holy Spirit was at work in the gift of tongues, and on this ground, enlarged the strictly Jewish limits within which their master had confined them "in a singular and inconclusive manner," (p. 178.) Peter had no better foundation than a dream, which was the result of hunger, for giving to Christianity a cosmopolitan character, (p. 169.) Paul taught "confused and contradictory notions on the subject of marriage;" and "there is much in the tone of his doctrinal writings which we believe and feel to be at variance, or at least little in harmony with the views and spirit of Jesus," (pp. 183, 190.) John, in his first epistle, "abounds in denunciations, all too redolent of the temper of the apostle who wished to call down fire from heaven on an unbelieving village," (p. 154.) James alone, whose epistle (marvellous to relate) Mr. Greg willingly receives as genuine, "is one who had drank in the spirit and appreciated the lessons of the meek, practical, and spiritual Jesus," (p. 185.) But why speak of these and similar criticisms on the disciples, when the critic permits himself to adopt the style he applies to the Master? There is much veneration, indeed, professed, and we do not dispute that it is honestly felt. Such an error in logic we will readily tolerate as leaves in any man a reverence for Jesus out of which something higher and better may yet grow. But, in a matter of logical criticism, we must deal with Mr. Greg's statements as we find them, and look to their inevitable tendencies. At one time no words are too strong for his admiration of the greatness and

wisdom of Jesus, and he sets down to the misrepresentations of the evangelists all those doctrines ascribed to him, which form the "peculiar, startling, perplexing, revolting, and contradictory doctrines of modern orthodoxy,—doctrines which unsophisticated men feel to be horrible and monstrous," (p. 152) : such as the necessity of faith to salvation, the sinfulness of unbelief, the Deity of Jesus, and the Atonement. These are too obviously unsound to have formed a part of his teaching: And yet, though "the wisest, purest, noblest being that ever clothed thought in the poor language of humanity," (p. 228,) his doctrines were not "so new, so profound, so perfect, so distinctive," as not to be essentially contained in the Old Testament. He "appears to have held erroneous views respecting demoniacal possession, the interpretation of Scripture, his own Messiahship,* his second coming, and the approaching end of the world," (p. 230.) "He neither directed nor contemplated the spread of his gospel beyond the pale of the Jewish nation," (p. 168.) Even his moral system, though "unimprovable and unsurpassable," and "fitted to make earth a paradise," (p. 244,) has some such "radical defect, or incompleteness, or inapplicability in our day and country, that any one who *strictly* regulates his conduct by its teaching (putting aside the mere letter) is immediately led into acts which the world unanimously regards as indicative of an unsound or unbalanced mind," (p. 246.) And then, on some essential points, Christianity, even as Christ left it, is unquestionably a stumbling-block to the wise and reflective of all ages. Thus the doctrine that prayer is answered, as Christ taught it, is "obviously irreconcilable with all that reason and revelation teach us of the divine nature," (p. 248.) The Christian idea of forgiveness which Christ shared, "is unmeaning or blasphemous as applied to Jehovah," (p. 264,) because the forgiveness of sins in any other sense than the abandonment of them is impossible; and to crown all, so far as the evidence goes, "the views of Christ respecting the future world were less in advance of those current in his age and country than his views upon any other topic," and "perhaps even fall short of those attained by some pious Pagans of an earlier date," (p. 280.) Strange blunders and shortcomings these for "the most exalted religious genius whom God ever sent upon the earth—in himself an embodied revelation" (!) (p. 233.) Was it worth while to sift the gospels clear of all "Orthodoxy" and "Calvinism" by so laborious a process, to leave so much chaff

* The Messiahship of Jesus Mr. Greg does not seem to know what to make of. At one time Jesus is spoken of as believing "himself sent to fulfil the functions of the expected Messiah," (p. 118.) At another time the Messiah expected by the Jews is said to have been "of a character so different and a career so opposite to those of the meek, lowly, long-suffering Jesus, that the passages describing the one never could have been applied to the other without a perversion of ingenuity, and a disloyal treatment of their obvious signification," (p. 62.)

still among the wheat? The doctrines of the New Testament are destroyed by its own moral teaching like a temple burnt down by a coal from its own altar, and then the hapless coal itself is blown out. A Caesarean operation, fatal to the parent life, is performed on the gospels, to extract from them the genuine Christianity, and then the miserable infant perishes by the hard nursing to which it is subjected!

Upon the whole, this singular tone of apparent reverence and ultimate depreciation with which Mr. Newman and Mr. Greg alike treat the greatest names in Judaism and Christianity, is to us a matter of unfailing wonder; and the singularity and self-contradiction might even be regarded as giving a mythical character to their entire productions. We have met, however, with one fact which, so far as it goes, deserves to be mentioned, as proving such phenomena not altogether unknown to history. Mr. Walpole, in his *Travels among the Anasyrii in Mount Lebanon*, informs us of a man who came suddenly upon a company of that strange people in the midst of the rites of their mysterious worship. They had dressed up a wooden figure into an image of Providence, and this they were assiduously engaged in flogging. The parallel is complete, shewing what deviations from nature may arise without absolute miracle. Here too is the wooden image baptized with the name of a divinity, and the prevailing rite of worship is flagellation.

This theory of inspiration then may be left to fall by its own weight; and we have little doubt that soon the field will be swept clear of its ruins, and the ancient land-mark re-erected between those who regard the Bible as the mere product of imposture and fanaticism, on the one hand, and those who regard it as containing a supernatural revelation from God, on the other. Such an issue is likely to be hastened by some of the works at the head of this Article. The historical argument for the books of the New Testament is very clearly and effectively put by Dr. Tregelles, who re-exhibits the materials of honest old Lardner and of Paley, with the freshness and authority proper to one whose life has been devoted, and not in vain, to the prosecution of original researches, with the view to a critical edition of the New Testament. This tract and the more elaborate treatise of Davidson lately noticed in this Journal, amply show how irrefragable, as mere historic documents, tried by all the ordinary tests of genuineness and authenticity, the sacred books are, and will establish as a necessary corollary their supernatural character, in the case it is to be hoped of all who are not prepared to believe in any monstrosity short of the miracle of a revelation, or to disallow the heavenly oracle because it does come from heaven, and is higher than our ways and thoughts.

Here, too, rank the ingenious, learned, and eminently candid Tracts, entitled the "*Restoration of Belief*." The First Part of this series is a mysterly re-exhibition of the argument from the success of Christianity in its struggle with Paganism, taking the reader back into the bosom of the martyr-Church, laying open the spring of its calm, grave, and indomitable earnestness in witnessing to the gospel facts, and the Person of Christ as the centre of them, and urging the question whether a crisis in the world's advancement, which not only carried through these truths in mortal battle, but gave to all professing faith, and even to disbelief, a moral grandeur unknown before, and thus cast on honest infidelity a ray of heavenly light such as had never before fallen upon it, had its source in "a congeries of exaggerations, and in a mindless conspiracy, hatched by chance, nursed by imposture, and winged by fanaticism," (p. 110.) The Second Tract, with the same calm, invincible logic, pursues the argument through the apostolical Epistles, making good such a *cohesion* between the natural and supernatural element in them that, on the denial of the latter, the apostolic character becomes "a jumble of inconsistencies, to which no semblance of moral or of immoral unity can be given," (p. 219.)

We pass over then to the ranks of the SUPERNATURALISTS, by whom alone, in propriety of speech, theories of "inspiration" can be entertained, and shall endeavour to signalize some of the more noted and influential theorists of recent times. We need not take the trouble of collecting their testimonies to what they hold in common—that Christianity is a supernatural revelation—that that revelation is contained in the Bible, and that there rests upon the Bible in consequence an authority *sui generis*, and such as belongs to no other book in the world. But it immediately strikes us, that through this large, and we trust, (notwithstanding all outcries to the contrary,) increasing class, there runs one great line of division which parts them off into adherents of the Bible in a more lax or in a more strict sense. The most superficial glance discovers two theories more or less opposed to one another—in much it may be in appearance, but in not a little also in reality—forming what may be called the theory of *partial* and the theory of *plenary* inspiration. Under these two rubrics, accordingly, we shall bring the remainder of our critical review.

The two most influential reasoners on the side of partial inspiration which this century has produced are Schleiermacher and Coleridge. The one has acted upon German theology, the other on British and American; and a curious parallel might be drawn between them in respect of more questions than this of inspiration. Our limits require us, however, to restrict ourselves to

this one point; and we prefer to begin with Schleiermacher, both as the earlier, and as having carried out his views to more bold and therefore more easily apprehensible results.

Though Schleiermacher was not fond of the name of supernaturalist, and sought by sundry devices of a dialectical kind to break the shock which the admission of a miraculous interference gave to his philosophy, nothing is more clear than that all the good which he effected in Germany was by the restoration of Christianity to its supernaturalist elevation, and by insisting that it is a manifestation of divine truth and grace, infinitely raised above all reasoning, morality, and other pre-existing resources of the world. He did not look, however, on this divine quality as originally communicated in the Bible, but in the Person of Christ, which was to him the grand centre of devout regard, and focus of influence on the spiritual destinies of men. Christ was the word of God, the living word, imparting, so to speak, a magnetic property to those who came in contact with him, more especially his apostles, thus revolutionizing the world by their living example, and not merely by certain articles of faith transmitted to them in a dogmatic shape, and then engrossed in a written document, to be held out to the intellectual reception of mankind. With him Christ is first, the Church second, the Bible last. The Bible is the product of faith, pre-supposes faith to its comprehension, and is in no other sense the work of the Holy Spirit than all succeeding Christian literature, save and except that its separate parts were written by those who, standing nearest the divine Saviour, drank most into his Spirit, and reflected the universal Christian sentiment in relation to Jesus in its highest purity. This normal value of the Bible is not affected by differences of opinion respecting the canon, or the origin of the sacred books themselves. There is enough of unity and certainty in the main to make the rejection of certain writings (Schleiermacher not only himself rejected some of the so-called Deutero-canonical books, but the First Epistle of Timothy) a matter of little moment to Christian faith. There is a sufficient reflection of the divine presence of Christ in the books themselves to satisfy all the necessities of the Christian consciousness, though some of the gospels may have been compiled from fragments, amid the ordinary liabilities of history to error, and though the epistles were sent forth with no more distinctive aid and guard against defect than lay in the apostolic training and experience of their authors. Hence not only in the critical settlement of the canon and text of Scripture, but also in its interpretation, a large place is to be assigned to Christian consciousness, as the living continuous principle from which the Bible originally proceeded; and in the settlement of the true and divine by this organ, that writing has most authority

which bears most directly on Christ and his work, so that the contents of the New Testament have a graduated scale of importance, and the Old Testament has no normal dignity whatever.*

Serviceable as these views were when first propounded, and great as was the stride which they evinced beyond the Kantian estimate of the Bible as a mere legendary vehicle of morality, it will be seen at once, that they allow to the Scriptures a partial and scanty measure of inspiration. We have here the source of a very current formula in Germany, that "God's word is in the Bible; but that *the Bible* is not God's word." Schleiermacher to some extent veiled the imperfections of his own scheme, partly by the admirable eloquence and fervour with which he descanted on what was true in it, *e.g.*, that Christ is the fountain-head of a glorious change in the spiritual life of mankind, and that personal communion with him is necessary to exalt the word above a dead letter; and partly by an ingenious accommodation of his style to Church-formulas of greater rigour and fulness. Yet his theory will not stand the test of anything like that keen examination with which he loved to abate what he regarded as the exaggerations of orthodoxy.

We think it may be admitted that the presumption is against a theory which receives revelation but denies inspiration and infallibility. We are far, however, from wishing to rest much (in point of argument we desire to rest nothing) as has sometimes been done, on mere *a priori* likelihoods and anticipations in regard to so mysterious and sublime a work of God as the giving of a revelation to mankind. Could it be *proved* that revelation extended no farther than Schleiermacher has contended, we for our parts would be thankful for so much; and though with a Bible in our hands, much of which was uncertainly divine, and not a little of which was unquestionably uncanonical, we should still have struggled on our way beneath the broken rays that came from the eternal word, hoping at last to reach the goal of so trying a pilgrimage, and to find the explanation of error and defect in the Bible, as we found the explanation of the like staggering phenomena in God's world and in God's Church. Still, a reasonable man will hardly deny that with the idea of a supernatural revelation we more naturally connect that of a *permanent document, which fully partakes of the qualities of that revelation, and secures it for all ages*; and as there is a clear and indisputable miracle at any rate, it seems, so far as can be judged, more suitable and worthy of God to make that miracle complete, and to deposit its results not in a written production, which errs so greatly both by excess and defect, but in a Bible as immaculate as its great subject. Schleierma-

* *Glaubenslehre*, vol. ii. pp. 477-509, (1st edition.)

cher boldly confronts the difficulty of believing in an immaculate Christ. Is it not like an in consequence to cast away the fruits of this infallibility or let them fall to the ground?

A still greater difficulty is the total inefficiency of the principle according to which we are to separate, in the actual Bible, the valid and ultimate word of God from its admitted imperfections. "Christian consciousness," we are told, is to distinguish, even in the writings of admittedly apostolic men, between what is divine and what bears the mark of human infirmity. And this consciousness is to recognise as sacred whatever treats directly of the person and work of Christ, and to allow a gradually increasing admixture of error in all that lies beyond. We say nothing of the soundness of this rule. What we insist on is *its total inutility*. It is utterly impossible to separate the person of Christ from the whole New Testament theory of creation and providence. Do passages which speak of his pre-existent state and universal natural rule claim our faith or not? Are the discoveries respecting the future life sufficiently connected with his person and work to be absolutely reliable? Where is the boundary between the little and the great in the biographies of the evangelists? Are we with Schleiermacher to regard the alleged doctrine of Jesus respecting demoniacs, as one of the narrator's mistakes, touching, as it did, no vital point; or, rather with Neander, as a true report, since the subject was mixed up with the whole of Christ's work of deliverance from sin and evil? Such questions are endless. But we cannot help adverting to the Messianic prophecies of the Old Testament, to which Schleiermacher leaves a kind of shadowy dignity amid the dethronement of all besides. As it is confessedly a matter of disputation with him what portions of the Old Testament are to be ranked in this class, we have here a continued problem whether or not *any* part of the Old Testament can be clearly made out to be the word of God at all; and the reverence which is felt for it on this theory, must to some extent resemble that of the Mussulman for the piece of waste paper, on which he refuses to tread lest it should contain a part of the Koran; or if this be thought extreme, the language must hold which was applied to the Samaritan idea of the Old Testament, "Ye worship ye know not what."

But by far the most formidable and indeed utterly insuperable objection to this theory of partial inspiration, is *its contrariety to the distinct, emphatic, and universal utterance of the Bible respecting itself*. This is, after all, the turning-point of the argument. Uncertain as this doctrine makes the boundary of canonical Scripture, and also how much of the canon is infallible, there is enough of unchallengeable Scripture (we here speak of it as a mere historical document) left over by this theory to overthrow

itself from the foundations. The principle that authority in teaching belongs to the companions of Christ, as the result merely of his life-long action on their minds, is opposed by the whole history of the prejudices and errors of the apostles, down to the time of Christ's death. It is also incompatible with the history of Paul, whose authority Schleiermacher admits, but lamely enough attempts to harmonize with his view. If we do not tear the whole gospel record asunder, and do violence to the inductive principles by which all history should be studied, it was not the mere presence of Christ, but the operation of the Holy Ghost, that led the apostles into all truth; and though that truth was connected with Himself, much of it had not during his life-time dawned on their minds, for he had many things to say which they could not then bear, and which they were yet to teach the world. His own motto was—"I have given unto them the words which thou gavest me;" and though his glorious divine example had also its influence, this is not to be disjoined from that doctrine of which he spoke as coming from God, and that truth which was able to make free. It was not then merely as prolonging Christ's utterances that the apostles had authority. The spirit of Christ was in them a fountain of independent inspiration; so that inspiration was not, as Schleiermacher contends, an incommunicable property of Jesus, but shared by the apostles. The apostolic claim put at the head of the epistles, is thus tantamount to the direct utterance of Christ, as it is indeed thus translated by Paul, (in a sense how different from the recognition of any co-ordinate vote of Christian consciousness!) "If any man among you think himself to be *spiritual*, let him acknowledge that the things which I write are the commandments of the Lord." If epistolary inspiration was thus guaranteed to such a degree, that even an angel from heaven preaching another gospel was declared accursed, not less surely was the infallibility of the apostles secured, as writers of the gospel-history, by the promise that all things should be brought to their remembrance which Christ had said, words which, on Schleiermacher's theory of a natural reminiscence of divine communications, have absolutely no meaning. Thus the whole basis of apostolic authority is shifted away from the point where Schleiermacher placed it, to another where it ranks with that of Christ himself, and where, dissociated from a divine nature, or even pre-eminent endowments, it is placed on the same footing of a heavenly mission on which Christ himself put it: "As thou hast sent me into the world, even so I have sent them into the world." This *co-ordination* extends by the testimony of Christ himself not only to the apostles, but goes back to Moses and the prophets. No limitation of authentic Scripture can get rid of Christ's appeal to the authority of Moses, as testifying of Him,

or his frequent quotations from the Old Testament, as a divine book. The repeated recognition of Moses as a prophet pre-eminently like Christ, cannot be impugned; and Schleiermacher himself has acknowledged that Second Epistle to Timothy, and employed it to impeach the first, in which it is affirmed by Paul with reference to the Old Testament, that "all Scripture is given by inspiration of God."* Many more express passages and general principles from the New Testament might be adduced to corroborate those already cited. But these are sufficient to prove (leaving for the present Schleiermacher's unsettlement of the canon to the historical evidence which re-establishes it) that inspiration was not so bound and restricted to the life of Christ as to exist elsewhere only in gleams and shadows, requiring "Christian consciousness" to detect it; but that by the showing of Christ himself, his own inspiration found its work in developing truths and doctrines which pre-existed by inspiration in the Old Testament, and was transmitted to the apostles with such clearness and authority as to leave Christian consciousness no other place but that of devout submission to whatever came from apostles in word or writing as revealed doctrine. The true place of Christian consciousness is thus, to take words for once out of the mouth of Strauss, expressed by the precept, "Taceat mulier in ecclesia;" and no claim can be set up for it, on the ground that as the Church preceded the Bible, it ought to have a voice in assenting to or rejecting it, for this is merely to say that the apostles preceded their writings, and their piety their inspiration,—commonplaces which are rather an insecure foundation for a doctrine of universal inward light, to which the sources of Christian belief give no sanction.

The effect of Schleiermacher's views of inspiration is to this day abundantly apparent, not only in the less advanced school that have kept true to his traditions, and waged in his name violent opposition against the orthodox, but likewise in the more enlarged and independent thinkers, such as Nitzsch, Julius Müller, Twisten, and Tholuck, who with Neander at their head, and shortly before his death, united more openly than they had ever previously done under the banner of Schleiermacher's memory, virtually to resist the advances of that more strict supernaturalism which from various influences was gaining ground in Germany. These eminent men, indeed, have far exceeded Schleiermacher in their concessions to the older orthodoxy, and to a great extent have returned to those results in regard to the canon and the supreme authority of the apostolic Scripture which in the first revival of faith in Germany were regarded as extreme. With the exception, perhaps, of the Book of Revelation and the Second Epistle

* The other interpretation of these words is considered afterwards.

of Peter, they do not express much hesitation as to the right of any part of the New Testament to its place, and they yield to the Epistles all the reverence which is possible on the highest theory of inspiration. Almost no exception occurs to us as taken by them to any apostolic statement but that of the approaching end of the world, which they represent the apostles (we think on very unsatisfactory grounds) as unanimously leading their converts to expect. The masterly compend of apostolic doctrine given by Neander in the second volume of his "History of the Planting of the Church," is a great step beyond Schleiermacher; and no intelligent adherent of a more rigid theory of inspiration can quarrel with his exhibition of multiplicity in unity in the views of Paul, Peter, James, and John, but will rather admire the profound Christian wisdom and truth with which points of apparent opposition are adjusted and harmonized. A similar change is very clearly reflected in Nitzsch's "System of Christian Doctrine." He admits that the absence of Christ was compensated by the presence of the Paraclete, and that revelation was thus transmitted in its original purity; that no one can receive the Word of God save through the apostolic writings; that appeal to any other authority, such as inward light, independently of these writings, is mere fanaticism; that the Church has not given the Scriptures any claim to authority, but receives all its own authority from them; and that the Church is based on the Scriptures—in other words, on the belief, that the same power of God to which we owe the revelation made in apostolic preaching, has been exerted to give us in the Scripture a unique, distinct, and perfect conveyance of that revelation. Nay, Dr. Nitzsch goes so far as to maintain, that the Church, even in Christ's own day, rested on *written* revelation, seeing that both He and his apostles appealed to the Old Testament; and that thus, to use his own words, "there never was "an absolute interregnum of oral teaching."* It is obvious how widely these representations tend to depart from the ground of Schleiermacher, and to approach to the theology of the Reformation; yet in the same treatise there is a tendency both to elevate Christ's inspiration above that of the apostles, and by consequence to depress the latter nearer to the level of the ordinary working of the Spirit in the Church, which clearly betrays the influence of the school; just as if, in order to exalt the Saviour, it were necessary to make Him an *absolute starting-point in the history of true religion*, and in comparison of his direct utterances to depreciate all his indirect revelations both before and after his Incarnation.

* These principles are, for brevity's sake, compendized from the fifth German edition, §§ 37-42.

The views of inspiration which lie at the basis of Neander's "Life of Jesus Christ" endure less satisfactorily a logical examination than those of almost any other work of this great and influential theological party. There is much, both of depth and beauty in his construction of the evangelical history as a whole; and it did not need his acuteness and learning to expose at a thousand points the utter preposterousness of the mythical theory. Yet the result of his treatise is in many respects unsatisfactory as a full reflection of biblical data, and even as an application of his own principles in his earlier work. He contemplates the gospels throughout as purely historical compositions, partaking of no other inspiration than that radiated from their subject. He acknowledges in them no inconsiderable number of positive errors—for example, that Matthew puts a false sense upon the "sign of Jonas," and that John erroneously applied the words "destroy this temple," to the Saviour's resurrection. He concedes the point, that they have (especially John) sometimes put their own words into the mouth of Jesus, or (especially the synoptical evangelists) mixed up discourses altogether different, and out of their proper connexion. He extends their fallibility to arbitrary lengths—as, for example, that John might be mistaken in supposing that Judas was guilty of peculation; or Mark, in ascribing the death of the Baptist to the revenge of Herodias, and not as Josephus, to Herod's fear of insurrection. And he will allow nothing in their narrative for which he cannot find a guarantee in their natural capacities and opportunities of knowledge, maintaining that the disciples were too much agitated at the time of their Master's apprehension to give a perfectly accurate account of it, and that we have no evidence that the veil of the temple was rent at the crucifixion, unless it may be that some converted priests afterwards furnished the information. These and similar statements appear to us serious blemishes in an otherwise admirable performance, which must militate against its acceptance in this country as a final reply to the work of Strauss. It is indeed a far harder task to believe, with those who reject the supernatural character of Christianity, that the whole life of Jesus is a superstructure of fiction, raised upon the slenderest basis of commonplace reality, than with the German Church historian, that a divine life was left to be reflected in a series of stained and broken mirrors. Only as the one procedure must be protested against as gigantic error, the other may be dissented from as mutilated truth, and that all the more that it is not consistent with itself. What room is left, on this principle of historical fallibility, for the promised and admitted influence of the Holy Spirit? In Neander's pages the synoptical evangelists are throughout represented as following a system of one-

sided, partial, and defective compilation—as unlike as possible to the style of men from whom the early Church, to say nothing of inspired critics still in the midst of it, expected, according to their Master's promise, and received their highest narratives of the highest of all transactions, which lay at the foundation of Christianity; and even John is thrown entirely upon the resources of his memory for his copious and often intricate reports of our Saviour's discourses; without having put to his credit a single help like that of Paul, "I have received of the Lord, that which also I delivered unto you." It must be set down as another and a great inconsequence, that Neander freely applies the harmonistic principle to the larger apparent discrepancies between the gospels, as, for example, respecting the seat of our Lord's ministry, and the scene of his appearances after the resurrection—the presence of parables in the other gospels, and their absence in John—our Lord's residence in Nazareth or Bethlehem—the resurrection of Lazarus, the agony in the garden, and many others, while the lesser discrepancies are abandoned as irreconcilable. The principle of repetition is admitted in the case of the Saviour's anointing, and even suggested in that of the entry into Jerusalem, while in the face of the most positive testimony it is denied in that of the miracle of the loaves. The principle of accommodation in our Saviour's allusions to Jewish opinions is discarded, and yet he is made to quote in the temple the 110th Psalm, as one in which David in spirit calls the Messiah Lord; though Neander thinks it probable that David did not write that psalm, and that the unknown writer of it, whatever the ultimate view of the Spirit, had no reference to the Messiah whatever. How much incoherences like these tend to impair the compact and logical form of the work in which they appear, is felt both in Germany and in this country; and if Neander complains, as he does in his preface, that his theology suffers from the principle, "*τὰ ἐν μεσῷ ἀμφοτέρωθεν κτείνεται*," it must, with all deference, be replied, that his own armory supplies the javelins to both the opposite sides by which his *juste milieu* is attacked.

Without animadverting upon other works of adherents of this theory we shall confine ourselves to the last, and by much the most interesting of them all—one which may be regarded as a kind of confession of faith from this camp of partial inspiration. We refer to the essay of Dr. Tholuck in the "*Deutsche Zeitschrift*" for 1850. This publication was started in the beginning of 1850, a few months before Neander's death, and at his instance, in conjunction with Nitzsch and Müller, as a weekly organ of the theology and Church politics of the middle school, which needed some such counterpoise against the sturdy energy and growing influence of that formidable Berlin journal,

"Hengstenberg's Kirchenzeitung." Though greatly crippled by the lamented death of its founder this organ has taken a high place, and has called forth many valuable essays; though it may be remarked that it has too much ballast and too little sail for the widest kind of popularity. In this periodical Dr. Tholuck was called upon almost immediately to discuss the doctrine of inspiration; and his four papers, from April to November 1850, are mentioned at the head of this article. The two first are historical, and are intended to prove that the doctrine of strict or plenary inspiration, has not been held by the majority of Christian writers and churches from the beginning, but one more free and lax, admitting not only a human element, but the presence of error to some, though not to a serious, extent in the sacred books. In this historical inquiry it appears to us that Dr. Tholuck has been eminently unsuccessful. He sets up the most rigid theory of inspiration ever broached—that prevalent in the 17th century, according to which not only the writers were entirely passive (*calami spiritus*), and the words dictated to them in one even stream, but likewise the Hebrew points and accents, and even the general punctuation, were declared to be immediately from God. He finds abundant evidence that *this* theory was neither held in the early Church, nor by the Reformers, nor sanctioned in any confession before the 17th century. But he totally fails in what ought to have been the great object of his review—to find, in any epoch of the Church, before the commencement of the rationalizing period that began with Grotius and Leclerc and continued throughout the 18th century, such plain admissions of error in the Bible as should serve for a breastwork to modern German evangelism. The utmost that Dr. Tholuck can make out like a precedent for this view, among the Fathers, is an acknowledgment of Origen, who is himself, however, admitted to have held the strictest theory of inspiration, that he could not on historical principles harmonize the gospel accounts of Christ's last paschal journey; and a statement of Chrysostom, who otherwise believed that all contradictions of the sacred writers were only apparent, that Paul in his speech before Agrippa was left to some extent to mingle the workings of his own mind with the supplies of grace—a statement perfectly consistent with the infallibility of Scripture. The only one of the schoolmen who roundly charges any of the sacred writers with error is Abelard, whose authority, however, on a theological question, is of the lowest. The rash expressions of Luther must be admitted, balanced, however, by the strongest assertions elsewhere, that Scripture was immaculate. But the other Reformers, and especially Calvin, are quoted with injustice on the same side, for what they say amounts to this, (what every harmonist has repeated,) that there were chronolo-

gical and other difficulties, which they could not perfectly remove. Calixtus, to whom Dr. Tholuck traces the origin of the laxer theory which at length prevailed in the Lutheran Church, in express terms admits the entire truth of the biblical records; as did Baxter, Doddridge, and other English divines, both of the Church and among Dissenters, whose names are singularly enough introduced with those of Socinus and the Arminians, as all conspiring to prove that the theory of infallibility has always been in the minority. Dr. Tholuck, then, who cannot be supposed to have brought forward the least effective witnesses, seems to us to have completely failed in establishing for his theory, anything at all approaching to an influential standing-ground in the general tradition of Christian doctrine.

Dr. Tholuck's other two papers are occupied more with the exegetical and dogmatical aspects of the question; and though they evince, perhaps, the nearest approach which is possible from this side to what we must still call the orthodox* theory, they are far enough from obviating the objections we have already advanced to the views of its earlier representatives. Dr. Tholuck undertakes in this part of his work to do three things—to test the strict inspiration theory by the structure of Scripture—to adduce biblical testimony for the laxer theory—and to turn aside the Scripture testimony unjustly alleged for the other view. This is certainly a fair and honest programme. We cannot pronounce that it has been carried into execution.

In considering the structure of Scripture, Dr. Tholuck acts hardly by his antagonists, among others Gaussen whose theory we shall afterwards notice, in descanting on the peculiarities of style and the evidences of mental individuality in the sacred writers, for this has never been more eloquently illustrated than by Gaussen himself, and may be regarded as now universally admitted. It is more to the purpose, and this is the gist of the argument, when he asserts, that in the Old and New Testament there are “numerous proofs of inaccuracy in matters of fact;” and he charges the scrupulously orthodox with using such elaborate and forced devices to remove these, that at last Scripture in their hands has come to resemble a garment covered with innumerable pieces of patchwork, rather than a seamless coat. Dr. Tholuck knows well enough, and frankly confesses, that the opponents of Christianity have often spied a rent where there was none; but still thinks himself bound to concede that in not a few places the rent exists. We cannot within our limits follow him into detail: but having examined his proof-texts, and knowing something of what has been written regarding them, we take the liberty to adhere to our old opinion,

* See a former note.

that the same arguments* by which Dr. Tholuck in his elaborate and valuable reply to Strauss, obviates his attack on the *larger* inconsistencies (so-called) of Scripture, avail also to the elimination of his own *minor* difficulties. Dr. Tholuck, beginning with misquotations of the Old Testament, according to the Septuagint version, thinks he has found three such in the Epistle to the Hebrews, where errors in the Septuagint are made the basis of reasoning.* We do not enter into the philological and other discussions connected with this question. In opposition even to the high authority of Dr. Tholuck, we regard all these citations as legitimate grounds of argument, the variations from the Hebrew being unessential to the proof, and agree with Calvin in his note on the last, though Dr. Tholuck inaccurately represents him as admitting a misapplication of this and the second of his examples:—"Neque enim in verbis recitandis adeo religiosi fuerunt, modo ne Scriptura in suum commodum falso abuterentur. Semper hoc spectandum est quorsum citent testimonia, nam in scopo ipso diligenter cavent ne Scripturam trahant in alienum sensum; sed tam in verbis, quam in aliis, quae presentis instituti non sunt, sibi liberius indulgent."

Such inaccuracies of discourse, next alleged by Dr. Tholuck, as the different versions of the sermon on the Mount, by Matthew and Luke, we set aside by adhering to the old explanation of a double discourse, though there seems no contradiction between different reports of the same speech, if neither reporter professes to give the whole, nor in its absolutely identical connexion. The same principle applies to different applications of the same proverb, as of the blind leading the blind, or of a tree being known by its fruits, for surely this is a proof of mental fertility worthy of admiration: and it is rather curious by the way, that Strauss argues against *that* repetition as the mark of an empty head, a departure from which Dr. Tholuck thinks fatal to the accuracy of a discourse.

Inaccuracies of fact Dr. Tholuck admits to be much exaggerated, and on the supposition that the sacred writers did not adhere to the order of time, unjustly charged upon them. He appeals, however, to some undoubted lapses of memory, as where Abiathar is put for Abimelech, (Mark ii. 26,) Jeremiah for Zechariah, (Matt. xxiii. 9-10,) Barachias for Jehoiada, (Matt. xxiii. 35,) and where Paul makes 23,000 fall (1 Cor. x. 8) instead of 24,000. We must confess that we see nothing more forced in the explanations of these difficulties by the harmonists, than in Dr. Tholuck's own essays of the like kind, *e.g.*, the taxing under Cyrenius, or the double calling of the Apostles. It was in the days of Abiathar that the incident in David's life

* The passages are chap. ii. 6, 12, 13; x. 5; xii. 26.

happened. Jehoiada might be the grandfather of Zacharias and Barachias his father:* Jeremiah may have crept in by a corruption of the text, and Paul may have given the number that fell approximately, there being more than 23,000 and less than 24,000. We do not, however, by any means hold it to be necessary to justify an honest belief in the infallibility of the Bible, that every such example as Dr. Tholuck has adduced should be summarily and convincingly explained. We freely acknowledge the difficulties in some cases which, notwithstanding all efforts of this kind, still exist. In books so extensive, so ancient, so liable to error in transcription, especially in the case of resembling names and numbers, the marvel to us is not that so many real difficulties exist, but so few, and that so many reasonable suppositions can be made in almost every case to effect harmony—suppositions precisely of the same kind which advocates of partial inspiration employ against those who reject supernatural revelation altogether, and which critics devoid of all Christian prejudices, apply to the chronology of Herodotus and Berosus, or the narratives of Tacitus and Josephus. The infallibility of the Bible rests on its own inductive evidence, and this evidence is not abolished by such discrepancies, though the number already fairly eliminated by honest criticism is continually re-inforcing it, as is also the marvellous verification, by all antiquarian research and progress, of the minute accuracy of Scripture where it once was questioned. We must deny, therefore, the validity of Dr. Tholuck's procedure, when—after having gone a great length in removing discords—he at last stops and says, “here is unquestionable error.” We should rather leave these outstanding difficulties as problems for criticism and motives to fresh investigation, not shutting our minds to honest scruples, nor forcing others to swallow our premature solutions, but neither also refusing the strong historical testimony of Scripture to its own infallibility, nor doing it the injustice of shrinking from carrying through that infallibility in detail.

In examining these allegations of Scripture respecting itself, Dr. Tholuck betrays the weakest part of his own system. The *locus classicus*, “All Scripture is given by inspiration of God,” &c., he translates, as might be expected, “every writing that is inspired is also profitable:” and affirms that it was the design of Paul to give to Timothy a criterion of true and false Scripture, viz., the power of the former to make the man of God perfect. We do not assent to Dr. Tholuck's translation on philological grounds; but much less on logical, for is it not unnatural to make Paul write to Timothy in an age when every body

* Even De Wette and Strauss are almost satisfied with some explanations of this difficult text.

was agreed about the Old Testament canon, as Schleiermacher might have lectured to his class, when setting up the inward criterion; and does not the same result after all come out as on the other principle of translation, for the reference to "the Holy Scriptures" in the preceding verse proves that Paul in speaking of *any* Scripture as inspired spoke of *all*, and meant to ascribe to all the same salutary effects. Dr. Tholuck next runs *sicco pede* over the weighty statement, Rom. xv. 4, "Whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning, that we through patience and comfort of the Scriptures might have hope," on the ground that much of the Old Testament does not excite hope but terror; as if the Apostle meant to enumerate all the kinds of learning derivable from the Old Testament, or as if hope in God's faithfulness were not increased by examples of punishment as well as reward. We can least of all commend, however, his treatment of our Saviour's words, (John x. 35,) "The Scripture cannot be broken," which he does not hesitate to regard as accommodation to Jewish notions of the rigid accuracy of the Old Testament, even as the argument from the use of the word "gods" (Ps. lxxxii. 6) is nothing more than an *argumentum ad hominem*. We are sorry to see any part of the accommodation-theory, long dead and buried, even by "critical science," thus revisit the glimpses of the moon; more sorry still that it should re-appear under the auspices of one who has done so much to give its *quietus* to the rationalism of Gabler and Paulus, of which that theory was a living member.

These passages are almost the only ones which Dr. Tholuck thinks it necessary to examine, as appearing to sanction the alleged claim by Scripture to its own infallibility. But these, strong as they are, represent in a very inadequate degree the whole strength of the case. Every assertion in the Old Testament or the New, in which occurs a "Thus saith the Lord," or an appeal to authority derived from Christ, not only guarantees itself, but affords a presumption that the writer in question was not allowed to mix his own errors with the truth of God. Every argumentative quotation by our Lord or his Apostles is a direct proof that the sacred writer quoted was regarded *by them* as on a level with themselves; and even the more ornamental quotations are made with tokens of respect, and in phrases of deference that amount to the same thing. The whole of our Saviour's ministry is a perpetual commentary on his own words, *Ἐπεὶνῆκε τὰς γραφὰς*, and he even dies with them on his tongue. In the Epistles of Paul alone, upwards of 250 quotations, many of them argumentative and turning on the minute accuracy of the original, exist; and each of these speaks as plainly as it can for the uniform authority of the source whence it is taken. Evidence of this kind must be studied in detail; and any one who reads through

the whole Bible, as we have lately done, with the view of estimating the magnitude of its own claims, direct and indirect, for itself, may well be astonished at their number and variety, and must regard the specimens examined by Dr. Tholuck as only like the occasional highest peaks of a great mountain range, where everything asserts for itself an elevation above all ordinary levels. There is of course no later revelation to do honour to the New Testament as it does to the Old; but can any one believe that the Gospels, little as they claim in comparison for themselves, are not exalted by the very act of quotation that ratifies the histories of the kings of Israel, or that when Christ treated the Hagiographa as divine, he did not virtually promise an equal authority to the least obtrusive memorials of the new dispensation? Against this mass of historical evidence in the form of claims, direct and indirect, there is nothing to be set on the other side. The alleged disclaimers of Paul are two-edged weapons cutting the hands of those who lay hold of them. Dr. Tholuck, for what reason we cannot tell, has concluded his *Essay* without giving his promised account of these disclaimers of infallibility by Scripture; but what others have written is liker an attempt to put them in the Bible than to extract them from it.

In parting company with Dr. Tholuck's essay, we must be permitted to say, though in opposition to his authority, that the case is very different between an immaculate Bible, bearing the weather-stains of time in various "readings," and one veined here and there with *original* flaws and imperfections. Not to speak of the different inference back to the author of the work in the two cases, there is in the former a constant approach to the original by critical appliances; while in the latter the absolutely true is never any nearer: and still more, not only does proved error work a greater unsettlement in the credibility of the Scripture, since we have not one sacred writer to check another, for every hundred manuscripts and other sources that we have to act as checks on corruption in each other, but the inconsistency of such errors with such high claims is far more painfully felt in the inspired scribes of the Bible than in the ordinary transcribers of their writings, and tends to shake more or less their entire authority. Many good men we know, and Dr. Tholuck among the best, have held their faith in the Bible unaffected by these credited errors; but they must ever be like a sting in the hearts of the great body of Christians, and when carried down to the multitude a Bible thus divided against itself becomes *felo de se* and cannot stand.

The discussion of the question of Inspiration by Dr. Tholuck, in the "*Deutsche Zeitschrift*," called forth two protests to which we shall draw attention as elucidating the struggles of Continental Theology around this fundamental article of faith. The first

protest came from Dr. Stier, a writer of great and growing influence, whose work on the "Discourses of the Lord Jesus," the title of which is prefixed to this paper, is perhaps the most important of all the contributions that have been made within the last decennium to German exegesis, and exhibits more wholesome results of the Straussian controversy, as well as a better antidote for its wounds than any other. In other writings, extending over a considerable part of the New Testament, he has endeavoured to carry out inductively a much stricter theory of inspiration than the middle school, and his books on the Psalms and on "Isaiah not pseudo-Isaiah," maintain reverential views of the Old Testament with a tenacity and vigour to which they are strangers. He everywhere lifts his voice against the current German practice of separating Bible interpretation from practical uses, and condemns in no measured terms the over-drawn style of courteous discussion on the common ground of science between those who hold the Bible to be the word of God and those who hold it to be a string of myths and traditions. He is a man of conspicuous individuality and power, more like Bengel in most things than any living German theologian, whom it would be well if he could imitate too in point of brevity. His great aim in his principal work is to vindicate the gospels by an inductive proof of their divine coherence, and to illustrate the mystic depth of our Lord's words, as well as their unity in the different evangelists, by a detailed review of them as the central and light-giving essence of his life on earth. We think that he has in most things exhibited the divine and self-evidencing meaning of the Saviour's teaching and relative history, and thus made good his own exalted views of inspiration more successfully than any German defender of the gospels who has yet appeared; while we by no means assent to all his conclusions, which suffer here and there from a disposition, not sufficiently restrained, to find connexions and deep senses where they probably do not exist. He does not contend for the absolute impeccability of the sacred writers in dates and names, but he draws the line of their infallibility a great deal closer than it has yet been done in Germany, and speaks with a strength and confidence of their absolute and entire inspiration, abating here and there the barest externalities, which is new in that country. "If the Son did not know," he says, "the day of his own second advent, need we wonder that the Spirit left his evangelists in ignorance of much respecting the dates of his earthly history. But no man will ever prove that they have committed one positive and essential error even to a day or an hour." The whole Scriptures, Old and New, he regards as in the same sense divine that the Son of God is, and uses that comparison of the written to the Incarnate Word, which can-

not be employed on any theory of partial inspiration. In the labours of such a writer we heartily rejoice, and regard him, and a school which he will no doubt create, as likely to do for the New Testament the same service on the principle of strict inspiration that Hengstenberg and others have done for the Old.

His protest against Dr. Tholuck's essay is somewhat intemperate in spirit, which is to be regretted, and perhaps all the more that the latter had hit a weak place in Dr. Stier's theory—the incompatibility of his emphatic, vehement, and oft-repeated assertions of the authority of Scripture with any admission in it even of a minimum of error. We agree with the scope of his protest against the so-called believing theology which Dr. Tholuck represents, as incapable of insisting with full earnestness on the surrender of human belief to the authority of God speaking in his word, but we also think he would improve his own logical position, and do no harm to his exegetical conscience, by casting away the last remnant of conformity to that middle system on whose waverings and fluctuations he has bestowed so much scornful eloquence.

The other protest which Dr. Tholuck's dissertation called forth was from Dr. Merle d'Aubigné of Geneva, who complained of an erroneous statement in it respecting the well-known breach caused by the retirement of M. Scherer from the Oratoire in that city in the end of 1849. This Dr. Tholuck had ascribed to a reaction against the extreme opinions of Dr. Gaussen, whereas Dr. Merle d'Aubigné in his reply, contained in the "*Deutsche Zeitschrift*" for December 1850, shews that Scherer had entered the Oratoire as a professor five years after the publication of Gaussen's work, and two years after the issue of a work of his own, in which sundry differences from Gaussen's opinions were openly expressed. Dr. Merle d'Aubigné and the Oratoire are entitled to the benefit of this explanation, as the misconception is still as current in this country as it was in Germany. In the same paper Dr. Merle d'Aubigné enters into a lengthened criticism of Scherer's views in order to vindicate the Geneva school in the matter of his dismissal, (or rather resignation,) and to secure for them against their late colleague the sympathies of German theologians; which naturally tended rather to the other side. This leads us to take some notice of M. Scherer's sentiments, which in a review like this could hardly be omitted, considering the interest they have excited in many quarters, though that interest is now dying away. We agree in substance with Dr. Merle d'Aubigné's estimate; but we prefer judging M. Scherer from his own words. His most important publication are his two letters, (*La Critique et la Foi*), the former addressed to the directorate of the Oratoire in giving in his demission, and containing his creed on the subject of partial in-

piration, with the reasons for his change from orthodoxy—the latter addressed to a friend, and attempting to shew that the Gospel of Christ survives intact though plenary inspiration be abandoned. We shall only touch lightly on this part of our subject, both because M. Scherer's opinions are already tolerably familiar to the British public, and because, in fact, they add almost nothing to those of Schleiermacher, but may be regarded as a translation of the latter into French rhetoric, unmodified by those corrections and abatements which Schleiermacher's own great disciples had applied to his system.

We wish to do all justice to a sincere though, as we believe, erring brother, who writes as one who knows and loves the Divine Author of the Bible, and who, so far as we can see, has acted with praiseworthy honesty and manliness in expressing his sentiments and abiding the consequences. It is the more painful to find in his publication grave mis-statements of obvious facts, fatal inconsistencies in his own creed, and opinions broached which strike at the foundation of all distinctive authority in Scripture whatever. Is it not a grave mis-statement roundly to assert that no part of the New Testament claims inspiration—to confound things so diametrically opposite as submission to God speaking in his own Word and speaking by a human representative who supersedes it—to lay on the shoulders of the unlettered Christian the whole burden of criticism ere he find his way to the Saviour, as if the orthodox theory did not proclaim to all the world the internal evidence of the Scriptures—and (though this is foreign to the main question) to charge the common theory of the atonement with making the Saviour “wrest pardon out of the hands of God?” (*Il ne l'arrache pas à Dieu comme le veut l'orthodoxe*, p. 39.) Then as for inconsistencies, can there be greater than to represent his own system as getting rid of history and criticism, when all the while he makes salvation still depend on the knowledge of the historical Christ, as he is revealed in the Scripture; or when he professes to believe in a Christ without the Bible, anon returns to the Bible as the only source of Christian experience, and again equalizes the inspiration of all Christians with that to which the Bible was due? May we not ask, if men are capable of judging of the alleged contradictions of the Sacred Writings who are thus blind to the real contradictions of their own? And notwithstanding these inconsistent admissions of the value and necessity of Scripture as the mirror of Christ's person and work, how destructive to its dignity such assertions as, that “every Christian ought to expect the same inspiration in kind as the apostles”—that “to cease to expect inspiration is the fall of the Church”—that “the word of Christ is not yet exhausted by the apostolic doctrine”—and that, “instead of sending our pro-

selytes to the leaves of some mysterious oracle, we must direct them to the great prophets of all time, and to the living instruction of the Church, and to the Word of God personified in his servants."—(Pp. 16, 46, 22.) Such incoherences and extravagances as these justify us in regarding M. Scherer's system of inspiration as not so much a theory as a rhapsody. Christ is now all-in-all; then the Scripture which contains his image is all-in-all; and then the Holy Spirit in the Church is all-in-all without any attempt to harmonize jarring contrasts or settle conflicting pretensions. We therefore do not pursue this investigation farther; but may direct our readers, in addition to Dr. Merle d'Aubigné's strictures, to the acute and vigorous papers of the Count de Gasparin, translated by Mr. Montgomery, which contain some fuller accounts of Dr. Scherer's speculations as developed by himself in the "*Revue de Strasbourg*," and exhibit at great length, and in a kindly spirit, the tendencies of his ill-assorted creed to increasing laxity and dissolution. It may be mentioned, that while the views of M. Scherer were not such as to awaken sympathy in this country or in the breast of French Protestantism, they have generally been regarded, even in Germany, as going too far; and in Geneva itself, where the sentiments of Tholuck and other German divines on Inspiration are represented in the national Church, M. Cellerier, one of their most distinguished professors, has expressly condemned M. Scherer's movement as fraught with Radicalism, and as tending only to overturn and to destroy.

To gather up the very latest utterances of French and German Protestantism on the subject of inspiration, we must refer to another controversy in which Count de Gasparin has been engaged. His antagonist on the occasion was Dr. Ullmann of Heidelberg, the well-known and accomplished editor of that first of German religious magazines, "*Studien und Kritiken*." Dr. Ullmann published some years ago a little work entitled "*The Essence of Christianity*," which was translated in 1849 into French by M. Sardinoux of Montauban, and was subjected to a most severe ordeal of criticism; having been designed for a public more accustomed than the French to speculation, and less liable to be startled by philosophical formulas as a part of the garniture of Christian ideas. In particular, Count de Gasparin made it the subject of a lengthened review, in the end of 1851, in the same Journal, (the "*Archives du Christianisme*,"), in which he had replied to M. Scherer; but it would appear (for we have not seen his article) in some respects with less success. Dr. Ullmann has discussed his objections in the third Number of his journal for 1852, with great candour, and we think has in most cases satisfactorily disposed of them. Count de Gasparin had brought against German evangelism the charge of mysticism,

and had given certain criteria of its presence in religious systems. Dr. Ullmann, whose studies have lain much among the mystical writers of the middle ages, has had no difficulty in proving these tests inapplicable, and has vindicated the right of true mysticism, in other words, of spiritual depth and discernment, to a place in all Christian piety and Christian theology. This does not particularly concern us, however, and is only mentioned to bring in the reference of the debate to inspiration. Count de Gasparin had charged German theology, as a mystical theology, with setting up an inward feeling, in place of an outward rule. To this Dr. Ullmann replies, (and it is so far satisfactory to have his testimony as to the question of right, whatever becomes of that of fact,) "True mysticism, as the defender of faith and love, against a religion of abstract notions and outward precepts, is far removed from any desire to tear itself away from *revelation* as the objective basis, and from *Scripture* as the certain rule of Christian life; and when such mysticism lifts up its voice in behalf of pious feeling, this is not with a view to drive the *Scripture* into the back-ground, and bring forward the other as a religious authority, but simply because the truth of *Scripture* can only become, by the medium of feeling, our living possession, and because what is read must be felt in order to bring forth fruit," (p. 566.) Than this nothing can be more just; but in replying a little farther on to Count de Gasparin's charge against him, in common with other German theologians, of denying the *exclusive* authority of *Scripture* as an outward rule, Dr. Ullmann is far less satisfactory, and in truth, betrays the confusion and incompleteness of thinking of which he had been accused. He admits that the Bible is an outward rule, the turning-point of Protestantism, but denies that it is exclusive. His reasoning is curious in favour of some inward supplement. Christ is the centre of the *Scripture*, and higher than the *Scripture*, therefore Christ as *exhibited* in the *Scripture* is the rule of our faith. Why should it not be said rather, "Christ *speaking* in the *Scripture*," according to the language of Peter, "Thou hast the *words* of eternal life?" But is not this *exhibition* of Christ an outward rule? "By no means," replies Dr. Ullmann, "the exhibition is made to faith, and faith is an inward principle," (p. 592.) "It is very true," we make answer, "but as faith is not creative, but receptive, you give up the question, else what do you make of your concession, that feeling cannot sunder itself from *Scripture*?" Dr. Ullmann descends to the strange evasion that the *gospel* is not a *law*, and that Christ has abolished the *legal* principle. What are we to conclude, then, respecting such phrases as "the *obedience* of faith," "the perfect *law* of liberty," or the solemn and terrible expressions of the Epistle to the Hebrews, as to the greater danger of those who rejected Christ

speaking from Heaven, than of those who despised Moses' law? We do not yield to Dr. Ullmann in insisting on the necessity of inward illumination by God's grace as the condition of a right treatment of the outward rule, and on the impossibility of ever adapting our spiritual nature to it, save by the assimilation of faith. But this does not abolish the authority of Scripture, as a God-given law; the recognition of its authority is the first step to the attainment of the inward conformity which is aimed at; and onward to the end of the Christian life the perfection of faith is the perfection of submission. Here, alas, is the sore place in German theology, even the more advanced, and till God himself be pleased to heal it, both the smiting and the salving of human criticism must be in vain!

We have mentioned Coleridge as among the most influential of the advocates of a partial inspiration, and his sway over the minds of many has perhaps been as great as that of Schleiermacher. He has determined, however, no such advance towards good in his country's theology; and the effect of his errors (as we conceive them) on this subject, though far less errors than those of Schleiermacher, has been proportionately more injurious. We admire the genius of Coleridge, and love the man; but our assent to his philosophical and theological creed (within the common limits of Christian faith) is extremely qualified; and could we utter all our mind on these points, to admirers like Mr. Maurice and Archdeacon Hare, our observations might have too much of an iconoclastic character. We protest indeed against the literary outrage lately done to Coleridge by Mr. Carlyle, as only injurious to the hand that dealt the blow, and trust that our passing remarks shall breathe a just respect for one who must ever hold a high place in British literature, and no mean place in Christian theology. We regret the error that struggled through life-long abortions to graft a higher style of Christian divinity on the intractable and mutually repellent philosophies of Kant and Schelling, and disfigured the simplicity of Bible truth with such disguises as *noumena* and *phenomena*, and such cabalistic quincunxes as the "pentad of operative Christianity." In this Coleridge was unlike Schleiermacher. In too much else they coincide—the depreciation of external evidence—the exaltation of the Church as a judge of the word, in Schleiermacher more in the individual, in Coleridge more as hardened into the tradition of the mass—and to come to the point before us, in the refusal of assent to the unlimited infallibility of Scripture. Coleridge's sentiments and tendencies on this subject are found, as all the world knows, in his posthumous work, "*Confessions of an Enquiring Spirit*," in many respects a valuable book, as it certainly is a most poetical one, and one in which no intelligent advocate of plenary inspiration need refuse

to admit, that there is much which may be studied with profit by all the adherents of that doctrine. The creed of this book is somewhat like the following. The divine influence to which we owe the Bible is of two kinds—(1.) *Inspired Revelation*, to which we owe the law and the prophets, “no jot or tittle of which can pass unfulfilled,” and between which and all ordinary grace, “there is a positive difference of kind—a chasm, the pretended overleaping of which constitutes imposture or betrays insanity;” and (2.) *the highest degree of ordinary grace*, to which we owe the *Hagiographa*, different only in degree from the ordinary actuation of the Holy Spirit, (pp. 88, 89.) So much for the Old Testament.—How the New is to be parcelled out into these classes Coleridge has nowhere informed us. It is contended that the inspiring influence has not been such as to guard against errors in detail, which, however, are now reduced to the lowest minimum, “some half-score apparent discrepancies,” “a petty breach or rat-hole in the wall of the Temple,” (pp. 40, 42,) and again enlarged so as to make one liable to be silenced by the infidel “who throws in one’s face the blessing of Deborah or the cursings of David, or the Grecisms and heavier difficulties in the biographical chapters of the Book of Daniel, or the hydrography and natural philosophy of the patriarchal ages,” (p. 54.) Nevertheless, it is maintained that the essential and glorious truth of Scripture, as a whole, will force its own way, more especially if it be presented rather as the supply of the deepest wants of our souls, than as an authoritative literal message from God,—a remedy verified and authenticated by the Church, and thus insinuated by the voice of experience and love, rather than enjoined by external sanctions as absolutely infallible.

Such is the substance of Coleridge’s own creed, as far as we can make it out, and it occurs to us to remark almost nothing in regard to it beyond what has been observed elsewhere, unless to complain of its silence regarding the New Testament, and to draw attention to the fact, that where errors in the Bible are once admitted the tendency is to widen the breach, as we see illustrated in Coleridge’s own recital, and that too in a didactic treatise.

These oversights and slips may be due, however, to the vehemently polemical cast of Coleridge’s style, which is here its characteristic feature. The book is rather an onset on the current dogmas of inspiration, than a calm and logical exposition of a new theory. It is certainly, in this respect, a sublime example of poetical passion and metaphorical objurgation, such as is perhaps unmatched in our literature. The hard charges brought against the dogmatists seem to resolve themselves into *three*. Of these we shall say a word in succession. *First*, There is the charge of *Bibliolatry*, in other words, of worshipping the letter of the Bible. This unfortunate term, coined in an evil hour,

and since freely bandied about by scorners in whose eyes Coleridge himself would have been a Bibliolater, he only applies to the practice of overlooking all difference in the argumentative value of texts of Scripture, and running away with scraps and clauses of verses (merely because they are in the Bible) on which to build doctrines or establish moral conclusions; and he regards this as the inevitable tendency—the *reductio ad absurdum* of the scheme of plenary inspiration, because infallibility admits of no degrees. We condemn the practice in question as much as Coleridge or any other reprover can do; and on whomsoever the stroke alights let it fall. But the inference deduced to the disparagement of plenary inspiration is *invalid*. The mind of the Spirit is maintained by no orthodox theologian worth naming to be identical with all that is recorded in Scripture; and as great authorities among the orthodox have protested against the unduly literal or unduly figurative systems or accidents of interpretation as among laxer schools. The very book of Job, to which Coleridge appeals, is mentioned in many treatises on plenary inspiration, as an example in much of its structure of the distinction between Scripture *as a record*, and Scripture *as an authority*; and indeed, the case is so plain, that we are almost ashamed to enlarge on it. His charge, except as against the weaker brethren of any Church, is the fruit of mere haste and forgetfulness. Why must the man who believes both letter and spirit to be from God, despise the spirit or neglect it? To use Coleridge's own figures, he has the kernel as well as the spiritualist, though the other may have the husk too, the sheaf as well as the straw-bands, and if he begin to worship the latter to the disparagement of the former, or to confound the one with the other, let him be duly reprehended, but let not a charge be flung at his head which strikes at the Bible itself as much as his abuse of it.

Again, there is the charge of *mechanism*, or denying all free spontaneous agency to the inspired writers. We believe that Coleridge is virtually the author of the much-repeated distinction between *mechanical* and *dynamical* inspiration, though these words are not used in his treatise. Many truly eloquent things are uttered by him against that construction of the Spirit's influence which suppresses all personality and conspiracy of the inspired persons: and the passage respecting Deborah in particular, (pp. 31–36,) lauded by Tholuck, and admired by Stier, we freely subscribe to. Still we doubt, (nay, we are sure of the contrary,) if this fine writing be anything better than beating the air, in so far as the controversy between limited and plenary inspiration is concerned. It is not the *mode* of inspiration that is discussed: it is its *extent* and that alone. As to the mode of inspiration, there are difficulties which neither Coleridge nor any one

else has solved or can solve. *To explain a miracle is a hopeless problem.* One may try his logic if he choose upon the conversion of water into wine. A dynamical theory would sound here as bald as a mechanical one. All colours are alike in the dark. And if the production of Scripture in the mass be a miracle, as Coleridge admits explicitly, at least in regard to the Law and the Prophets, and doubtless much besides, who shall pretend to track out its laws, or to make everything plain by a few such phrases as "personal individuality," "adaptation of native temperament," or "elevating of religious consciousness?" If Deborah was in her normal state she was not a prophetess, (at least *in actu*;) if she were out of it, who shall psychologically explore the difference? We do not deny the co-operation, or rather the sublime possession of the sacred writers (*φερομένοι*;) with the inspiring influence: and we believe also that that influence adapted itself to the laws of their mental working, as we see in some abnormal states of mind higher types of its natural thought and imagery. But who that looks at the prophets rapt into scenes utterly new, and left in darkness as to the meaning of their own visions, while still the individuality is as perfect as in the barest chronicle, can shut his eyes to the mysteries of the question, or think that by the jingle of *mechanical* and *dynamical* he has abolished something tamely literal on the one hand, and established something profoundly spiritual on the other? If this polemic against mechanism has any meaning as applied to the extent of inspiration, as distinct from the mode, it seems to amount to this, that the sacred writers were dynamically inspired that they might occasionally err, in other words, ceased to be inspired at all where the dynamic element came in, so that the dynamic element was not strength but weakness. There must be a fall it seems to demonstrate freedom: and the sacred writers must command our sympathies by shewing that they are our erring brethren. Pure gold is too hard and unmalleable: the coinage of heaven cannot be worked up without its dross and alloy.

Thirdly, There is the charge of *sceptical consequences*. Coleridge contends with great amplitude and vehemence that the doctrine resting on no foundation of rational evidence, but on a weak fear of consequences should any error be once admitted in God's word, and on a superstitious craving for an external infallibility that might rival the papal, in fact draws after it, by its exaggerations, the very consequences it was meant to preclude, and strengthens scepticism within and without; leaving the Church to be disturbed by every suspicion, and the Bible to be overthrown by every proof of its internal discord and inaccuracy. Now, in reply to these allegations we at once deny the frequent

charge, that the sources of belief in plenary inspiration are such *a priori* anticipations or such straits of controversy as is gratuitously supposed. The historical certainty that much of the Old Testament, as Coleridge himself admits, was directly written as an oracular communication—the promise of our Lord to his disciples to bring all his words, and surely also their connecting facts, to their remembrance by a Spirit equal in infallibility to Himself—the imperial and authoritative strain of the three great sets of Epistles, not to speak of repeated claims to an inappellable supremacy as of men who had the mind of Christ—the deferential quotation of the Old Testament, as a whole, by both Christ and his apostles—together with reasonings founded on the Hagiographa and obscurer parts of the Old Testament, in which they are expressly spoken of as the work of the Holy Ghost—to say nothing of all-inclusive declarations of its divinity as it then existed—these, with many minor arguments and irresistible inferences to the less strongly guaranteed parts of the New Testament canon, form *a basis of positive evidence* to which Coleridge has given no weight, and which none of his school who still develop this theoretical origin of the doctrine they oppose, have fairly looked in the face. Coleridge, indeed, only once glances at the tributes by our Saviour and Paul to the Old Testament, as affording a plea for full inspiration, but scornfully sets these aside as no more pertinent than a general eulogy on Shakspeare would be to settle the authenticity of Titus Andronicus or the poetical merits of Henry VI. But he all the while forgets that the tributes in question are *not general but special*, exactly as if the depreciated works of Shakspeare had been quoted under his name, and declared to be full of his spirit. We repel, then, as singularly unjust the assumption that the doctrine in question is the mere progeny of fear and weakness, and not of reverence for the recorded declaration of the highest authority that Christians own. But does it truly plunge us in those consequences it was hypothetically invented to obviate? To us no inference seems less fair and conclusive. Even M. Scherer grants that had we a mass of contradictions and errors in Scripture which we could not shut our eyes to, still *positive assertions of its infallibility by a competent authority* should produce an antinomy, and leave the mind *in equilibrio*. It is a reckless exaggeration to maintain, as is sometimes done, that a single proved error in the Bible should utterly nullify the whole body of historical evidence that proves the miracle of its inspiration. That evidence could stand a harder strain than has ever yet been laid upon it, leaving the believer in plenary inspiration in doubt and perplexity indeed, but not in despair. It is not denied that earnest and honest minds, who have held this doctrine, have

had their times of mental agitation. The man who has had none, or who speaks disdainfully of his fellows who have passed through this struggle, has our wonder rather than our sympathy. But should a few apparent errors make a mountain of evidence tremble in the balance? Difficulties, except to sceptical minds, do not produce scepticism, but only lead to a more thorough weighing of evidence and exploration of light. And will any candid man say, that if the emergent, and as yet unsolved difficulties of Scripture, amount to no more than Coleridge's summation, "some half-score apparent discrepancies in the chronicles and memoirs of the Old and New Testament," they form a rational basis for scepticism, or warrant the renunciation of an otherwise proved doctrine? We have seen how slender an array the crucial instances of Dr. Tholuck exhibit, and no competent student of the Bible, not of a morbidly fault-finding temperament, can rate them very much higher. Without any unreasonable straining of faith, the necessary brevity of narration, the occupation of different points of view, the neglect of chronological details, and many other circumstances, may surely be supposed to have given a discordant aspect to some parts of Scripture from the beginning. Nor is it an evasion, but a perfectly honourable solution, to ascribe some considerable portion of the alleged phenomena to accidents of transcription. It should be borne in mind, too, how many once magnified difficulties (such as the post-Mosaic origin of alphabetic writing) have since vanished, and how other "breaches and ratholes" (we take words as they are given us) have been stopped up even to the satisfaction of those who apply most sternly the dark lantern of criticism to such apertures, and labour to enlarge them. The moral discords between the Old and New Testament spirit, to which Coleridge also alludes, do not seem more fairly to warrant the sceptical inference. The "cursings of David" are not more terrible than our Saviour's denunciation of the Pharisees; and one who does not find any difficulty in regarding the wrath of God revealed from heaven against all unrighteousness and ungodliness of men, as perfectly consistent with love, should not be greatly stumbled by that sublime impersonal hatred of evil and of evil men as evil, which breathes through the Psalms of David as the blast of heaven against the face of wickedness. We search in vain through the Old Testament for any approved severity which was not done in God's name; and if Coleridge believed Jael guilty of the odious perfidy he seems to impute to her, would not this be to make Deborah sing her own condemnation, and fall not only below the level of prophetic inspiration, but of vulgar humanity? We permit ourselves one remark more on this subject. If the spirit of the Old Testament was not purged by inspiring influence in

its approved models and sanctioned monuments, why is the alleged defect limited to one field? Why is vindictive wrath the only stumblingblock? Why have we no ode to chant the praises of domestic servitude, no hymn on the blessings of polygamy, no counter-epithalamium on the felicities of divorce? To us the marvellous freedom of the Old Testament from sanctioned moral discords with the New, is one of its most supernatural features, and reduces apparent exceptions to insignificance and shadow.

These are some of the guards by which a believer in this doctrine might honestly escape every sceptical pitfall. Nor is a single prudential rule which Coleridge has laid down for guidance in dealing with the honest sceptic inapplicable on the other side. The internal evidence of Christianity is here also—its glorious history—its incorporation with all truth and nobleness in the best periods of the world's leading nations. We can as fairly as he turn these objects first to the inquirer's eye, ere it meet the counterbalancing difficulties, though we care little for any arrangement that looks like concealment and reserve. These considerations for the sceptic all remain, nay, remain in far higher efficiency, for they crystallize around the Bible as their fixed centre. The echo in the Church leads back to the original voice. The brightness of the camp conducts in every line to the sacred Ark with its Volume over which the glory rests.

We shall not do Coleridge the injustice of confounding his mitigated expression of the defects of the Bible, with what has been heard from some members of his school. We shall not press him with the retort that applies with irresistible force to them. The separation of the truly divine from the human and imperfect element in the Bible has been represented as a most difficult and painful process—a process in which the learned chiefly can have a share—and one which affects and modifies many received conclusions respecting Bible authority. It would almost seem to be a principal part of the discipline of a Christian's life to construct out of the common text his critical edition; and this discipline is alleged to be as salutary in its own nature as secure in its results. Of this fraction (we hope it is nothing more) of the school of Coleridge, we will only say, that we neither envy them the blessedness of their trials, nor the safety of their attainments. The voyage to heaven is trying enough, with its shifting winds and treacherous tides, without adding (if clear evidence do not demand it) the presence of leakage in the vessel, and the frequent sound of starting timbers. We deplore the struggles of an honest mind in this predicament—thoroughly honest and at the same time thoroughly intelligent. The abatements it must make from the natural meaning of the Bible in speaking of itself—the total

uncertainty where to draw the line between the essential and unessential elements of the compound—the incapacity of appeal to an inward criterion without exalting it above the admitted revelation—the helplessness of the guidance of the Church, which on this supposition is but a multiple of the same incapacities; all would seem to make this position one of prolonged disquietude, which could only be escaped by final scepticism, or by returning to an infallible Bible, or by rushing into the arms of an infallible Church. In the presence of the sceptic, especially, such a defender of Christianity would be sore pressed by the cross examination, “If you give up the Bible as a *regula regulans*, how is it to be printed as a *regula regulata*? Who is to issue your expurgated edition, and on what principle? Where are you to put in the brackets, the italics, the obelisks, like buoys and beacons of an unsafe navigation? Your lighthouse of the world is itself in error, not only by an aberration of the light but by a nutation of the luminary. What Bureau of Longitudes shall supply the ephemerides (*Höhere Kritik, Wissenschaftliche Kritik, Endresultate der Exegese*) to help the poor mariner to his haven?”

On the manifestations of British opinion subsequent to Coleridge favourable to partial inspiration, our limits forbid us here to enter. Our estimate of the theory of Arnold, as it is incidentally developed in his Sermons, may be easily gathered both in its light and shade from our previous criticism. Of Mr. Morell's system we shall only remark, that it is but an expansion of that of Schleiermacher, with this leading difference, that Schleiermacher's “religious consciousness,” a modification of “feeling,” is supplanted, not always, or indeed generally, in a consistent manner, by Cousin's “intuition,” a power of “reason.” On the psychology of this system, which seems to us to err still farther in making logic conversant with the fragments of intuitions to which it is utterly blind as wholes, we shall not now animadvert. We protest chiefly against the fundamental fault of his work on the “Philosophy of Religion,” in its bearing on inspiration, that it throughout abolishes an objective source and rule of subjective piety. We insist as strongly as Mr. Morell on the need of a supplementary influence to make the outward standard spiritually available; nor shall we quarrel greatly with any psychology that agitates the question by what inward powers, or by what combination of them, this spiritual comprehension is made. But to lower and thrust into the background the objective side as springing up only secondarily, and as being affected by the imperfections of the subjective in “verbiage, memory, mere judgment, and logic,” is what we regret to see done by a writer of his talents and

sincere aims; and if our preceding reasoning be of any value, the doctrine of biblical infallibility thereby sustains great injustice. We regret also the inevitable tendency to equalize the intuitional consciousness in the historical Church with that from which the Bible on this theory first sprung, so that in regard to its interpretation we hear from Mr. Morell such echoes of the results of M. Scherer as these, that "we should not be always looking to the vestments of worn-out ideas, instead of interpreting the living voice of God as it speaks to us in the phenomena of the present hour."—(P. 351.) If this course be once taken everything is downward. Religion becomes an affair of universal suffrage. Dogmatic is merged in Statistics. And the eternal Alp of an infallible Bible, the same in sunshine as in storm, melts away in the haze of a *fata morgana*, reflected from below, and varying with the changes of the atmosphere. Far be it from us to make light of the adaptations of the Bible to our deepest reason, or of the consent of the Church, like the voice of many waters, amid all minor and jarring noises, to its cardinal principles. But Mr. Morell's language tends farther than this by a great deal, and looks like an unhappy relapse to the criterion of rationalism under a Christian name.

"This light and darkness in one chaos joined,
Who shall divide? The god within the mind."

Closing here our review of theories of partial inspiration, we are happy to think that an examination equally extensive of the varieties of the theory of plenary inspiration, as it has recently been held and asserted, is by no means called for. Minor differences appear in such standard works of a comparatively bye-gone period as those of Dick and Henderson, and in such essays, representative of the views of large sections of British Christianity, as those of Dr. Eadie, Dr. Harris and Dr. Candlish. The spirit, however, is the same; and it is satisfactory to observe a growing purpose to treat as indifferent the psychological niceties of the question—such as modes and degrees of inspiration, and the inspiration of the words, which we may truly say is, in more senses than one, as distinguished from that of the thoughts and sentiments, a *verbal* controversy—and to rally around the one capital article of the INFALLIBILITY of the Bible.

With peculiar gratification, considering the quarter whence it comes, and the traces it bears of the school of Coleridge, do we welcome the truly learned, vigorous, and genial work of Mr. Westcott of Cambridge, on the "*Elements of the Gospel Harmony*." Such a reaction in favour of a plenary inspiration, intelligent and thoughtful, firmly held yet charitably pleaded for, is to us one of the most satisfactory signs that could be given from any Eng-

lish school of theology. Mr. Westcott's book is thoroughly informed with all recent German literature, and contains independent views on the gospels, and researches into patristic opinion. It stands on much the same parallel as Dr. Stier's work already noticed, (admitting, however, no minimum even of proved inaccuracy in the evangelic records,) and, with many of the merits, it has perhaps some of the imperfections of its German analogue, such as occasional fancifulness, and straining after hidden senses and well-balanced *schemata*. We sincerely regret that our limits prevent us justifying these remarks by examples. We cannot omit to notice the elaborate catena of the views of the fathers on inspiration, given by Mr. Westcott, which may be read as a corrective to the summary of Dr. Tholuck, and also the evidence from the pseudo-Clementine remains that our Scripture canon did not spring up in mist and darkness, but under the eye of a negative school as wakeful and active as the Ebionites of the present day. The whole style of Mr. Westcott's work shows how possible it is to think profoundly and reasonably without undermining the foundations of faith, and to be a debtor to Germany without being a slave.

The eloquent work of M. Gaussen of the Oratoire is, however, the most elaborate contribution that has been made of recent years to the literature of the orthodox side at home or abroad. With much in it we heartily accord, and cannot too much admire the fervour, brilliancy, and indomitable vitality by which it is distinguished. No one has more powerfully illustrated the individuality of the sacred writers, or urged more successfully the arguments from the language of our Lord and his Apostles, or obviated more convincingly the objection from various readings, and from the apparent unimportance of Scripture details. We cannot admit, however, the force of the reasoning that would exalt all the writings of the old and New Testament to prophetic dignity. We cannot limit the inspiration of the Apostles to their writings, for the mistakes in conduct usually quoted to prove this, were, as Tertullian remarks, "*conversationis vitia non predicationis.*" And still less can we sympathize with the rigid uniformity with which he carries out, in little harmony as it seems to us with his own views of individuality, the theory of an *ab initio* dictation in the case of every sacred writer without exception. We regret this narrowing of the standing-ground which the believers in an immaculate Bible might occupy against all disturbing theories, and greatly prefer, as an ampler programme of united action, the homely conversational criticism passed by an unnamed colleague of M. Gaussen, on this part of his work, as quoted by Dr. Merle d'Aubigné in the letter already noticed to the "*Deutsche Zeitschrift.*" "The

Holy Spirit has treated the sacred writers as a father his child when they are climbing a mountain together. There are steep places, where he gives him his hand, others more dangerous, where he takes him up in his arms; and sometimes there are places more level, where he lets him run alone. In every case he gives him the help which the circumstances require."

We must repeat, in closing this article, our profound conviction of the present value of the propositions we have sought to discuss and defend. Three powers are now in active contest for the mastery of the world—ROMANISM, NATURALISM, and EVANGELISM; and it is our assured belief, that if Evangelism does not everywhere become and rejoice to be known as BIBLICISM—thus availing itself of a position which we believe reason can fully justify by evidence—it must suffer in the collision.

The headless arrows of an arbitrary and sentimental pietism will hardly avail against the formidable onset of the dogmatic infallibility of Romanism. There is an axe in the Roman fasces, and these pointless darts run no small risk of being added to the sheaf. Extremes will continue to meet as they have met already; and those who have refused to yield unconditionally to God will end by submitting to a *human* yoke. There is, indeed, a subtle affinity between one human arbitration and another; and he who has found a rule in himself above the Bible, has little to change in finding it (in *practice* if not in *theory*) in a sacred corporation. It is then a comparative accident whether the magnetic current shall prove of a negative or positive kind; and the only influence which can break the circuit is the introduction of a new element—a faith distinct from either self-reliance or blind creature-worship—in the absolute Word of God.

So is it too in the struggle of Evangelism with Naturalism. We invite all who are undecided to re-examine the evidence for the infallibility of the Bible, *as a matter of fact*, convinced that assurance here will bar, as it surely ought to do, those unwise concessions to the so-called spirit of the age, which are inconsistent with the idea of a fixed revelation. The mission of the Bible is to conquer the age and not to yield to it—to ally with itself indeed all truth and all progress, but to impress on all its own sublime identity. What can the Bible suffer, if its friends are only true to it? With what new weapons can it be attacked? With what green withes can it be bound? What has the enlightenment of the nineteenth century done to supersede it more than that of the fourth or the eighteenth? Every age has more than one Erostratus: but while they are quarrelling for pre-eminence, the temple stands, and their torches expire. Strauss abolishes Paulus; and Ewald declares that in Strauss

there is absolutely nothing new. The giants, sprung from the dragon-teeth of scepticism, slay each other, while the Bible, like the immortal letters of Cadmus, (which are indeed its own,) passes on to mingle with the thought and speech of all lands and all centuries.

One might have hoped that by this time antagonism to such a book should have ended, a book that alights everywhere with healing in its wings, that has dissolved the worst fetters of humanity, marked the line for ages between liberty and despotism, as it seems almost about to do in our own between civilisation and reviving barbarism, and has so gathered up in itself all the rudiments of the future, and the seeds of advancement, that its eclipse would be the return of chaos, and its extinction the epitaph of history. The resistance of ages to this book, however, is, after all, its crowning legitimation. The Bible is too good for the race it has come to bless. It blesses them like an angel whose mission is peremptory, and it troubles too many waters in its work of healing to be left in peace. It is felt and feared by all the rulers of the darkness of this world. It is the visible battle-field of invisible forces, shewing in the radiant faces of the martyrs that have died for it, and the unearthly struggles of those who have hunted it from the earth, what mysterious interests are suspended on its safety or its destruction. No feeble suffrage can augment the claims of a book which has its witness below as signal as its witness above, which numbers, to say nothing of nobler trophies, its hundred millions of copies in circulation, and is going forth to the ends of the earth conquering and to conquer. But to vindicate its majesty against all doubters as made in the image of God, with everything of humanity except its weakness, all its parts and lineaments shining with the lustre of the divine face, here more veiled, there more open, and an unction descending on it from the head to the skirts of the garments,—this is an office as grateful to Faith as it is welcome to Reason. It is an altar which sanctifies the meanest gift. And the worshipper may well be lost amid the myriads whose brightest hope, after walking by this oracle through life's darkness, is to reach that sanctuary of peace, where reverence for the Highest is wounded by no discord, and where those who have been the last to believe shall be the first to adore.

- ART. VI.—1. *Travels through the Gold and Diamond District of Brazil.* By JOHN MAWE. London, 1812.
2. *Traité de Minéralogie.* Par M. l'Abbé HAUY. Tom. iv. pp. 419-440. Paris, 1822.
3. *A Treatise on Diamonds and Precious Stones, including their History, Natural and Commercial; to which is added the Methods of Cutting and Polishing.* By JOHN MAWE. Second Edition. London, 1823.
4. *Description of the Diamond Mine of Panna.* By FRANCIS HAMILTON, M.D., F.R.S., and F.A.S., Lond. and Edin. In *Edinburgh Philosophical Journal*, vol. i. p. 49. Edin. 1819.
5. *Notice respecting a Singular Structure in the Diamond.* By DAVID BREWSTER, LL.D., F.R.S., and Sec. R.S.E. In *Edinburgh Philosophical Journal*, vol. iii. p. 98. Edin. 1820.
6. *On the Diamond Mines of Southern India.* By H. M. VOYSEY, Esq. In *Asiatic Researches*, vol. xv. p. 120. 1826.
7. *Account of the Diamond Workings and Diamonds of Sumbulpore.* By PETER BRETON, Esq. In the *Transactions of the Medical and Physical Society of Calcutta*, 1826. Vol. ii. p. 261.
8. *Notice of the Diamond and Gold Mines of the Residency of the North-West Coast of Borneo*, in the *Singapore Chronicle*, October 11, 1827, and in *Edinburgh Journal of Science*, vol. ix. p. 123, 1828.
9. *Voyage dans le District des Diamans, et sur le littoral de Brésil.* Par M. AUGUSTE DE ST. HILAIRE. Paris, 1833.
10. *Observations relative to the Structure and Origin of the Diamond.* By SIR DAVID BREWSTER, LL.D., F.R.S., &c. In the *Transactions of the Geological Society*, Second Series, vol. iii. p. 455. London, 1835.
11. *A Treatise on Gems in Reference to their Practical and Scientific Value: a Useful Guide for the Jeweller, Amateur Artist, Lapidary, Mineralogist, and Chemist; accompanied by a description of the Most Interesting American Gems and Ornamental and Architectural Materials.* By DR. LEWIS FEUCHTWANGER, Member of the New York Lyceum, &c. New York, 1838.
12. *A Memoir on the Diamond, including its Economical and Political History.* By JOHN MURRAY, F.S.A., F.L.S., F.G.S. Second Edition. London, 1839.
13. *Catalogue of the Collection of Pearls and Precious Stones formed by the late Henry Philip Hope, Esq.* Systematically arranged and described. By B. HERTZ. Folio, 42 Plates. London, 1839. Printed for private circulation.

14. *On the Optical Properties of Muriate of Soda, Fluuate of Lime, and the Diamond, as exhibited in their Action on Polarized Light.* By DAVID BREWSTER, LL.D., F.R.S., Lond. and Edin. In the *Transactions of the Royal Society of Edinburgh*, vol. viii. p. 157. Edinburgh, 1816. Reprinted in the *Journal de Physique*, vol. lxxxiii. p. 81. Paris, 1816.
15. *On a Remarkable Property of the Diamond.* By SIR DAVID BREWSTER, D.C.L., F.R.S., and V.P.R.S.E. In *Philosophical Transactions*, 1841, p. 41. *
16. *Travels in the Interior of Brazil, principally through the Northern Provinces and the Gold and Diamond Districts, during the Years 1836-1841.* By GEORGE GARDNER, F.L.S., Superintendent of the Royal Gardens of Ceylon. London, 1852. 8vo.

THERE is perhaps no department of general knowledge about which ordinary readers are less informed than that which relates to the diamond. Even the mineralogist, the chemist, and the natural philosopher have limited themselves to a very partial study of the origin, the history, and the properties of this remarkable substance. Ranked as it must be among the bodies of the mineral world, and regarded as it has ever been as the most valuable production which the earth embosoms, it has always occupied, from its value as well as its beauty, the first place among those precious stones which it is the highest ambition of wealth and power to accumulate. But though thus associated with zircon, sapphire, ruby, topaz, and the emerald, it essentially differs from them all in its origin, its composition, and its physical properties; and while it takes precedence of them all, it is nevertheless the meanest in its elements, the weakest in its structure, and the most perishable in its nature. The full-grown diamond indeed exceeds in value more than a hundred thousand times its mass in gold:—It is the most cherished property and the proudest ornament of kings:—It is the most prized and the brightest jewel in the chaplet of beauty, and yet it is but a lump of coal, which it reduces to a cinder, and dissipates into that insalubrious gas which ascends from the most putrid marsh, and bubbles from the filthiest quagmire.

The word *diamond* is derived, through the French *diamant*, from the Greek word *Adamas*, *invincible*, and this again from *a* and *δαμαω*, to crush or subdue,—from its supposed property of resisting the action of fire and the heaviest strokes of the ham-

* Maximum in rebus humanis, non solum inter gemmas, pretium habet adamas, diu non nisi regibus et iis admodum paucis cognitus.—Plin. *Hist. Nat.*, lib. xxxvii. cap. 15.

mer.* The diamond seems to have been known from the remotest antiquity; and though it has not yet been found among the ruins of Nineveh and Khorsabad, we have no doubt that it will yet be discovered among the interesting relics of the Assyrian kings. The diamond is more than once mentioned in Scripture, but we have no means of ascertaining with accuracy that the original Hebrew words are rightly rendered in our translation. With the exception of the sapphire, the other gems mentioned in the Old Testament do not correspond with those which now bear the same names. In the breast-plate of judgment worn by the high-priest, the second row of precious stones consisted of the emerald, the sapphire, and the diamond; and as the *Urim* and *Thummim*, which signify *lights* and *perfections*, were "to be as Aaron's heart when he goeth in before the Lord," it has been conjectured that "they were diamonds of great beauty and splendour." The Prophet Jeremiah states that the sin of Judah was written with a *pen of iron*, and with the *point of a diamond*; and Ezekiel, in a mysterious passage, speaks metaphorically of the diamond and other precious stones as having been in the Garden of Eden. The Syrians are said to have carried on a trade in diamonds with eastern nations; and diamonds from the interior of Africa were procured from Etruria by the merchants of Carthage. Although, in speaking of the treasures at the time of the Trojan war, Homer does not enumerate any of the gems, yet it is certain that it was well known to the ancients. The Duke of Bedford possesses a diamond on which an antique head is engraved; and in the British Museum there is an ancient Roman gold ring with an octohedral diamond set in it.

In his work on Natural History, Pliny has devoted a whole chapter to the description of the diamond and its properties. He describes it as disseminated like gold in metallic veins—as accompanying gold, and as produced only in that metal. He says that the Ancients believed that it was found only in the metals of Ethiopia, between the Temple of Mercury and the Island of Meroë, and that it was never found larger than the seed of the cucumber, which it resembled in colour. Pliny then informs us that there were *six* kinds of diamonds,—the *Indian* diamond, the *Arabian*, the *Macedonian*, the *Cyprian*, a fifth called *Cenchron*, and the sixth called *Siderites*. The Indian diamond was not the product of gold, but had a relation to crystals. It was translucent like them, and it was hexangular, terminating in two

* Incudibus hi deprehenduntur, ita respuentes ictam, ut ferrum utrinque dis-
sultet, incudes etiam ipsas dissiliant. Quippe duritia inenarrabilis est simulque
ignium vitrix natura, et nunquam incalescens. Unde et nomen *indomita* vis
Græce interpretatione accepti.—Plin. *Id. Id.*

opposite points, as if two rounded cones were joined together.* The size of this diamond was that of the kernel of a filbert. Similar to the Indian diamond, but much less, is the Arabian, which has the paleness of silver, and is found only in the finest gold. He describes it as of the most extraordinary hardness, breaking anvils and hammers, and resisting fire and heat. The Macedonian diamond which is also found in gold, (*Philippico auro*,) has the size of a cucumber's seed. The Cyprian, so called from being found in Cyprus, verges into the colour of brass, and is most efficacious in medicine! The variety called Cenchron, is of the size of a millet seed; and the Siderites, which has the lustre of iron, exceeds all the rest in weight, and is dissimilar in its nature, for it is easily broken, and may be perforated by another diamond. Fragments of these stones, adds Pliny, are sought after by engravers, and when fixed in an iron handle they cut and excavate the very hardest stones. When Pliny assures us that the hardest diamonds can be macerated in the fresh blood of a he-goat,—that a magnet ceases to attract iron when in contact with a diamond;—that the diamond is an antidote to poisons, expels watery accumulations, and drives away from the mind vain fears, we obtain an insight into the low state of physics, chemistry, and medicine, at the time when he wrote. Pliny concludes his chapter with the interesting statement that Metrodorus Scepsius avers that diamonds are found in Germany and in the Island of Basilia, along with amber.

It would be a vain and unprofitable task to trace the history of the diamond during the centuries of intellectual darkness which followed the destruction of the Roman Empire. The diamond and other precious stones, pre-eminent in value above all natural bodies,—above even the gold and silver idols of human worship, were regarded if not as spiritual creations, at least as bodies with which spiritual influences were associated. The magical touch of the aristocratic gem, like the royal manipulation of more modern times, was an infallible specific in diseases which resisted the ordinary skill of the physician. It reconciled the parties in domestic feuds—it tested conjugal fidelity, and when the stone itself was worn as an amulet, it controlled the deadliest poisons—calmed the raving madman, arrested the magic wand of the enchanter,—paralyzed the witch's evil eye, and chased from the shades of night the restless spirits that hover round the couch of mortality. These precious qualities, which wealth alone could purchase for itself, and dole out to suffering humanity, were not likely to be dissociated from the crystals which possessed them, even when science had pro-

* Duo turbines—thus describing pretty accurately the octohedron with rounded faces, which is the most common form of the diamond.

claimed the real character and properties of mineral bodies. It is difficult, under any circumstances, to dislodge error from the seat which it has long occupied, but more difficult still when it has been interwoven with our interests and our fears. To find relief from pain, to add a fresh lustrum to declining life, to steal a glance into the future, and to obtain an interdict against his spiritual enemies, suffering and trembling man will grasp even the shadow of what may be truth, and relinquish it only when it has repeatedly deceived him. Even in the beginning of the seventeenth century, in 1609, when Boetius de Boot published his treatise "on Stones and Gems," and corrected the errors, and denounced the absurdities of preceding writers, he does not scruple to assert that though the superstitious and metaphysical properties which were ascribed to the diamond do not reside in the gem itself, they nevertheless belong to the angelic spirits which it has pleased the Almighty to connect in a mysterious manner with certain substances in nature.

Although the art of cutting and polishing diamonds had been known at an early period in India and China, yet it was only by means of emery or the powder of corundum, and a rude apparatus, that these effects were obtained. European jewellers had striven in vain to overcome the extreme hardness of the diamond, and it was not till 1475 that Lewis Van Berquen, a native of Bruges, conceived the idea of cutting and polishing diamond with its own powder. In rubbing one diamond against another he found that a facet was formed on each, and he was thus led to construct a polishing wheel, upon which, by using diamond powder in place of emery, he could grind and polish diamonds with the greatest facility.

Diamonds have now been found in every quarter of the globe. In Asia, Africa, North and South America, and even in Europe. In India they have been found of a large size, and in greater quantities, and it is accordingly from that part of the world that we received the earliest and the best information respecting this remarkable mineral.

The traveller to whom we owe the earliest as well as the most interesting account of the Diamond Mines of India, and of the diamonds which have been obtained from them, is Monsieur Tavernier, who performed six journeys to India chiefly on foot. As a diamond merchant every facility was given him to obtain the information which he desired, and the native princes allowed him to examine, and even to weigh the diamonds and other precious stones which they had accumulated. He was thus enabled to visit all the Four Diamond Mines then known in Hindostan, and also one of the rivers where the diamonds are found. The first mine which he visited was that of Raolconda, about

eight or nine days' journey from Visapour, and five from Golconda, which was discovered about the middle of the fifteenth century.*

"Round about the place where the diamonds are found, the ground is sandy, full of rocks, much resembling the parts near *Fontainebleau*. There are in the rocks several veins, some half a finger, some a whole finger, wide: And the miners make use of irons with hooks at the end, with which they pick out the earth or sand, which they put into tubs, and among that earth they find the diamonds. But because these veins do not run always straight, but sometimes down, sometimes upward, the miners are constrained to break the rock, following always the trace of the veins: when they have opened all the veins, and taken out all the sand, then they wash it two or three times over to look for the diamonds. In this mine it is that they find the cleanest stones, and of the whitest water. But the mischief is, that to fetch the sand out of the rock, they are forced to strike such terrible blows with a great iron-lever, that they flaw the diamond, and make it look like crystal: which is the reason there are found so many soft stones in this diamond-mine, though they make a great shew. If the stone be clean, they only give it a turn or two upon the wheel, not caring to shape it for fear of losing the weight. If there be any flaws, or any points, or any black or red specks in it, they cut all the stone into fossets; or if there be only a little flaw, they work it under the ridge of one of the fossets, to hide the defect. Now because a merchant desires rather to have a black speck than a red one, 'tis but burning the stone, and the speck becomes black. This trick at length I understood so well, that when I saw any stones in them that come from the mine made into fossets, especially very small ones, I was certain there was either some speck or some flaw in the stone."—*Tavernier*, p. 134.

At the mine of Raolconda there were several diamond cutters, who had each a steel mill, some of them like those used in Europe. "They cast water continually on the mill, to find out the grain of the stone," and when this is found they pour an oil (with abundance of powder of diamonds) to make the stone slide the faster, and in grinding a diamond which weighed 103 carats when cut, they laid on a weight of 150 pounds of lead.

The purchasers of diamonds paid two per cent. to the king on all that they bought. The miners, who know all the places where the diamonds grow, generally set 50 or 100 men to work, in a space about 200 paces in compass, and for the privilege of working this once they pay to the king two pagodas a day, and four when they employ a hundred men. When a workman meets

* *Les Six Voyages de Jean Baptiste Tavernier, Ecuier, Baron d'Aubonne, qu'il a fait en Turquie, en Perse, et aux Indes pendant l'espace de quarante ans.* Paris, 1751. 3 tom. Our extracts are chiefly from the English Translation, by Phillips. Lond. Folio. 1778. But our principal facts are taken from the original French, which contains much curious matter omitted by the Translator.

with a stone of fourteen or sixteen carats, he carries it to the master of the works, who rewards him with a piece of calicut to make a bonnet, of the value of 25 sous, together with a half or a whole pagoda. When large diamonds are found, they are brought every morning at ten o'clock to the merchants, with whom they are allowed to remain for seven or eight days, when the price is agreed upon, and a bill granted for it upon Agra, Visapour, or Surat. When the diamonds are small they are disposed of in another way, which Tavernier thus describes:—

“ ’Tis very pleasant to see the young children of the merchants and other people of the country, from the age of ten to fifteen or sixteen years, who seat themselves upon a tree that lies in the void place of the town: Every one of them has his diamond-weights in a little bag hanging at one side, on the other his purse, with five or six hundred pagods in gold in it. There they sit, expecting when any person will come to sell them some diamonds. If any person brings them a stone, they put it into the hands of the eldest boy among them, who is as it were their chief; who looks upon it, and after that gives it to him that is next him; by which means it goes from hand to hand, till it return to him again, none of the rest speaking one word. After that he demands the price, to buy it if possible; but if he buy it too dear, ’tis upon his own account. In the evening the children compute what they have laid out; then they look upon their stones, and separate them according to their water, their weight, and clearness. Then they bring them to the great merchants, who have generally great parcels to match: and the profit is divided among the children equally; only the chief among them has a fourth in the hundred more than the rest. As young as they are, they so well understand the price of stones, that if one of them have bought any purchase, and is willing to lose half in the hundred, the other shall give him his money. They shall hardly bring you a parcel of stones, above a dozen, wherein there is not some flaw or other defect.”—*Tavernier*, p. 135.

The following account of the “mystery” in which the Indians, whether Mahometans or Hindoos, “drive their bargains” with the diamond merchants, is given by Tavernier as something exceedingly curious. The sale is made in absolute silence, and without the least “talking on either side.”

“The buyer and the seller sit one before another like two tailors, and the one of the two opening his girdle, the seller takes the right hand of the purchaser, and covers his own hand and that with his girdle; under which, in the presence of many merchants that meet together in the same hall, the bargain is secretly driven without the knowledge of any person. For then the purchaser nor seller speak neither with their mouths nor eyes, but only with the hand, as thus: When the seller takes the purchaser by the whole hand, that signifies a thousand, and as often as he squeezes it, he means so many thousands

pagods or rupees, according to the money in question. If he takes but half to the knuckle of the middle-finger, that's as much as to say fifty. The small end of the finger to the first knuckle signifies ten. When he grasps five fingers, it signifies five hundred; if but one finger, one hundred."—*Tavernier*, p. 136.

The mine of *Gani* or *Couleur*, seven days' journey west of Golconda, was next visited by *Tavernier*. It stands near a great town, between which and a mountain is a plain, where they find diamonds. The nearer they dig to the mountain, the larger are the stones which they find; but none are found at the top. This mine was discovered about the middle of the 16th century by a man, who, in digging a piece of ground to sow millet, discovered a diamond of 25 carats. The news spread like wildfire, and the "moneyed men in the town set themselves to work," and found diamonds larger and in greater quantity than in any other mine. Among the largest was the celebrated diamond of nine hundred Rattees,* or 793 carats, which belonged to the King of Golconda, and which his General *Mirginola* presented to the Great Mogul. This diamond, known by the name of the *Koh-i-noor*, or *Mountain of Light*, passed through various hands, and after many changes in weight and in form, is believed to be represented by the Great Exhibition Diamond, belonging to Her Majesty, and now weighing about 100 carats.

Although the stones in this mine are remarkable for their size, yet they are less clear than those of other mines, their *water*, or lustre, partaking of the quality of the earth in which they are found. When the ground is marshy, the colour of the stone inclines to black, and when red to redness. In other places they are green, and in some yellow, but what seems very curious, "upon the most part of these stones, after they are cut, there appears a kind of greasy moisture, which must be as often wiped off." In order to discover the water of these stones, they examine them with a lamp in the dark; but the most infallible process, according to *Tavernier*, is "to carry the stone to a tree thick of boughs," in order "to discern by the verdure of that shade, whether the water be bluish or no." Above 60,000 persons were employed in this mine.

The most ancient of all the diamond mines in India is that of *Soumelpour*, a large town, near which is the river *Gouet*, a tributary of the *Ganges*, in the sands of which the diamonds are found. In February, when the floods in the river have subsided, about 8000 persons flock from the town, and search for the

* The translator says 900 carats, but this is a mistake, as will be afterwards seen.

diamonds in the sands of the river. The sand sometimes rises above the water, but when it does not, they drain off the water, and carry away the sand to another place, where it is washed, sifted, and examined.

About twenty or thirty years after Tavernier travelled in India, the Earl Marshal of England, who had visited several of the diamond mines on the coast of Coromandel, communicated an account of them to the Royal Society. Although mines of diamonds occur everywhere in the great range of hills which commence at Cape Comorin, and extend about fifty miles in breadth through the whole of Bengal, yet very few of them are worked, and it was chiefly from the kingdoms of Golconda and Visapour that the world was supplied with diamonds, before they were found in America. The Earl Marshal describes no fewer than *twenty-three* diamond mines in the kingdom of Golconda, and *fifteen* in the kingdom of Visapour. In one of these, called Currure, which is said to be the finest as well as the most ancient, and which is worked by the king for his own private use, diamonds weighing *eight ounces troy*, or $81\frac{1}{2}$ pagodas, or 960 carats, are said to have been found. About the beginning of the 17th century, when the country was under the government of the Hindoos, and when strangers were permitted to dig, a Portuguese gentleman went for this purpose from Goa, and having spent in mines a great sum of money, "he sold everything he brought with him that would fetch any money, even to the wearing clothes he could spare. While the miners were at work for the last day's expense, he had prepared a cup of poison, resolving, if that night he found nothing, to drink his last with the conclusion of his money; but in the evening the workmen brought him a very fine and great stone, of twenty pagodas weight, (206 carats,) in commemoration whereof he caused a great stone to be erected in the place, with an inscription engraven on it, in the Hindoo or Tellinga tongue, to the following effect, which remains to be seen to this day.

'Your wife and children sell, sell what you have,
Spare not your clothes, nay, make yourself a slave,
But money get, then to CURRURE make haste,
There search the mines, a prize you'll find at last.'

"After which he immediately returned with his stone to Goa."*

The mine of Wootoor, which is near Currure, yields stones of equal magnitude, and of similar shapes and waters, and, what is singular, the diamonds are found in *black earth*. The mine of Muddemurg is celebrated for producing diamonds of a fine

* Phil. Trans., No. cxxxvi. June 25th, 1677. Vol. xi. pp. 909, 910.

shape and water; and Melville, or the *new mine*, discovered in 1670, gives well-shaped stones of a very considerable size. The earth in which they are found is very red; and many of the stones found there have it sticking to them, *as if it had clung there, while they were of a soft glutinous substance, and had not obtained their hardness.*

The mines of Visapour yield stones as large as those of Golconda, though it is celebrated for its small stones, which yield a higher profit than the large ones. The diamonds are found in red and sometimes yellow earth, in all the fifteen mines of Visapour, and they are frequently enclosed in clods. The earth is carried to a sort of tank, with walls about two feet high and six feet wide, made of rugged stones joined together by mortar made of earth and water. This rude enclosure is strengthened outside by a bank, and is floored with stones. The earth from the mines is soaked in this tank, the clods broken, and the great stones picked out. It is then stirred with shovels till the water is muddy, and when the gravelly stuff has fallen to the bottom, and all the earth washed away, by using fresh water and running it off, the gravel is spread out and dried, and the diamonds which it contains discovered, and picked out by their reflecting the light of the sun. The diamonds thus found are sometimes secreted by the workmen. Tavernier states that they often swallow the diamonds when they discover a valuable one; and a merchant pointed out to him one of his workmen who had concealed one in the corner of his eye. In Golconda, where all stones under a pagoda weight were given to the miner, and all above it reserved for the king, this arrangement was often violated by the overseer of the mines, and when the workmen found a stone approaching in weight to a pagoda, "they conceal it till they have an opportunity, and then with wife and children run all away into the Visapour country, where they are secure."

The diamond mines of India have been more recently visited by Dr. Hamilton Buchanan, Dr. Voysey, and others, and we are enabled, by their descriptions, to give a more accurate account of the matrix of the diamond, or rather of the nature of the rocks or soil in which it is found. Dr. Buchanan visited the diamond mine of Panna in 1813. Round Panna is a table-land of great extent, from 500 to 1200 feet of perpendicular height above the level of the Gangetic plain. The whole plain in the table-land, for several miles round Panna, in all directions, is said to produce diamonds wherever it happens to be of a gravelly nature. The soil is very red in general, though in some places only slightly so, and is occasionally of a dark brown colour. The soil is from two to eight cubits deep where the diamonds are found, and contains many small pebbles a good

deal resembling some ores of iron that Dr. Buchanan saw in Bhagalpur. The diamonds are found intermixed with this, but they never adhere to any stone or pebble. They are obtained, as usual, by washing away the earth from the gravel; and they are generally very small, usually worth only 500 rupees, though sometimes they are valued between 500 and 1000. The Rajah had one worth 50,000 rupees, which he placed in the head of an image. The workmen are allowed *three-fourths* of the value of stones the size of a pea, or smaller; *two-thirds* of the value of those about the size of a hazel-nut; and *one-half* of those larger than a filbert. Every person that chooses may dig; and the average number of diggers is about a thousand. The rock immediately under the gravel and earth, among which the diamonds are found, is a white granular quartz, too hard to be cut for building, stained red in many places, and containing more *black spots*, or dots, than usual. The workmen assured Dr. Buchanan "*that the generation of diamonds is always going forward, and that they have just as much chance of success in searching earth which has been fourteen or fifteen years unexamined, as in digging what has never been disturbed; and, in fact, he says, I saw them digging up earth which had evidently been before examined, as it was lying in irregular heaps, as thrown out after examination.*"

The late Mr. H. Voysey, who visited some of the principal diamond mines of Southern India, in January 1821, has thrown some light upon the matrix of the diamond. In the rock mines of Banganpalli the matrix of the diamond is a sandstone breccia, which is found under a compact sandstone rock, like that of the rest of the range. "It is composed of a beautiful mixture of red and yellow jasper, quartz, chalcedony, and hornstone of various colours, cemented together by a quartz paste. It passes into a pudding-stone, composed of rounded pebbles of quartz, hornstone, &c. &c., cemented by an argillo-calcareous earth, of a loose friable texture, in which the diamonds are most frequently found." For many years previous to Mr. Voysey's visit to these mines, no fresh excavations in the breccia had been made, and he therefore could not ascertain the mode in which the miners got at the breccia; but he saw many holes about five feet in depth, under large blocks of sandstone, where he was told the diamond bed was found. Mr. Voysey confirms the statement of Dr. Buchanan, that the diamonds are supposed to grow in the old rubbish that had been previously examined. Nay, the truth of this opinion may be considered as demonstrated by the fact, that the miners no longer quarry fresh breccia from beneath the sandstone, but "*are content with sifting and examining the old rubbish of the mines,*" and in which they actually find diamonds. The opinion that diamonds grow in the previously washed,

sifted, and examined rubbish, and that the chips and small pieces rejected by former searchers actually increase in size, and in process of time become large diamonds, prevails everywhere in India; and even at Gani Partaal or Couleur, where the Great Koh-i-noor was found, the search is confined to the rubbish of the old mines. Dr. Voysey draws the following conclusions from his examination of the diamond strata in India.

1. That the matrix of the diamonds produced in Southern India, is the sandstone breccia of the clay slate formation.

2. That those found in alluvial soil are produced from the debris of the above rock, and have been brought thither by some torrent or deluge, which could alone have transported such large masses and pebbles from the parent rock, and that no modern or traditional inundation has reached to such an extent.

3. That the diamonds found at present in the beds of the rivers, are washed down by the annual rains.

In speaking of the probability of the opinion that the diamond is continually growing, Dr. Voysey makes the important observation, that in hot climates crystallization goes on with wonderful rapidity, and that he hopes, at some future period, to produce *undeniable proofs of the recrystallization of amethyst, zeolite, and feldspar in alluvial soil.* Unfortunately for science Mr. Voysey, who was geologist to the Indian Trigonometrical Survey, died soon after his paper was printed.*

An account of the diamond workings and diamonds of Sumbhulpore was published about twenty-five years ago by Mr. Breton of Calcutta. The valley of Sumbhulpore, about 410 feet above the level of the sea, and the streams at the mouths of which the diamonds are found, lie between the 83d and 84th degree of East Longitude and the 21st and 22d of North Latitude. Diamonds of various sizes, and of the first quality, are found at the mouths of the rivers Maund, Keloo, Eeb, and others, which rise in the mountainous parts of Koorba, Sirgoojah, Raeghur, Jushpoor, and Gangpoor, and fall into the Mahanuddee on its left bank. They are also obtained after the rains among the mud and sand deposited on the beds of islands upon the left bank, but never upon the right bank of the Mahanuddee, nor upon its left bank above its confluence with the Maund at Chanderpore, or

* It may be useful to those who study this curious subject, to know that Mr. Voysey has misapprehended the theory of Sir David Brewster, of the origin of the diamond, when he gives it as the opinion of that author, "that the matrix of the diamond is neither a rock of igneous origin, nor one of aqueous deposition;" whereas he merely stated, "that the compressible state of the diamond could not arise from the action of heat," and "could not exist in a mass formed by aqueous deposition," — *Edin. Phil. Journ.*, vol. iii. p. 100.

below Soanpore. About 500 persons are annually employed from November till the rainy season, in searching the bed of the Mahanuddee for diamonds, wherever alluvial matter is deposited in its hollows, or where the current is obstructed by rocks. The earth, dug out by a pickaxe, is placed on a large concave board, with two raised rims, and the diamonds are found among the gravel which is left, by washing away the earth with water along the inclined board. The earth consists of a mixture of stiff reddish clay, pebbles, a small proportion of sand, and a little oxide of iron. At Sumbhulpore a diamond of the first quality is called Brahmin, of the second Chetree, of the third Bysh, and of the fourth Soudra, the four tribes of the Hindoos. A diamond of 308 grains or 77 carats in weight was obtained in 1807 by the Ranee Ruttun Coher, and in 1809 one of the Bysh quality, and weighing 672 grains, or 168 carats, was picked up at a place called Herakode, in the bed of the Mahanuddee. The diamond was not delivered to the Ranee, on account of her being occupied in the funeral rites of her husband's mother; and before they were finished the Mahratta troops arrived and expelled her from her territory. The existence of the valuable diamond was told to the commanding officer, Chunderjee Bhoonsla, who persuaded the finder to surrender it for a fine village and 1000 rupees. No sooner was the diamond in the possession of the Mahratta chief, than he reproached the finder for bringing a stone instead of a diamond, and drove him from his presence.

The diamond mines of Borneo were known in the time of Tavernier, who was dissuaded from going to that island, because *The Queen* would not permit a stranger to carry off any of the diamonds, the few that were exported being taken away by stealth, and sold at Batavia. The diamonds are found in the sand of a river called Succadan. "I say the Queen," adds Tavernier, "and not the King, because in that island the women have the sovereign command, and not the men. For the people are so anxious to have a lawful heir upon the throne, that the husband not being certain that the children he has by his wife are his own, but the wife being always certain that the children which she bears are hers, they rather choose to be governed by a woman, to whom they give the title of Queen; her husband being only her husband, and having no power but what she permits him."

A more recent account of the diamond mines of Borneo was published in the Singapore Chronicle of October 11, 1827. The mines in the residency of the north-west coast of the Island are worked by the Daya, the Malayu, and the Chinese. The earthy gravel called *Areng*, in which the diamonds are found, is

obtained by sinking a shaft on the areng, about two feet in diameter, to enable the miner to turn round in it. The areng is from one to three feet thick, and is dug out to the extent of seven or eight feet from the sides of the shaft under the superincumbent strata, which are sometimes propped up. When the areng in the first mine is exhausted, and the course of the vein ascertained, a new shaft is opened in that direction, at the distance of fifteen or sixteen feet from the former one, to enable the miner when he reaches the areng to work back to the former mine, the same process being repeated till the vein is exhausted. The areng is hoisted up in small baskets, and then placed in conical circular trays, which are immersed in the nearest stream, and the areng washed by hand till the earthy particles are separated from it. The trays are then brought to the surface and whirled round, till the water they contain is poured off quite pure from all earthy matter. The Malayu use the same process; but the Chinese employ a more efficient one. The Chinese avail themselves of the shafts sunk and abandoned by the Daya or Malayu. Having formed a tank, or dammed up a small stream, a channel is cut in the direction of the vein, and the upper strata are entirely cleared away by the action of the stream of water. The areng is then dug out and washed in wooden troughs, fixed on an inclined plane. The largest diamond known with certainty to have been found in these mines weighed only *thirty-six* carats. The Sultan of Mattan is said to possess one weighing *three hundred and sixty-seven carats*, which he was afraid to cut lest it turn out to be flawed; but as the author of the article from which we quote informs us, "gentlemen to whom it has been lately shewn consider it not to be a true stone."

At one time all diamonds under *four* carats were the property of the miners; but all of that size and upwards were claimed by the Panambachan, then a tributary of Bantan, from the Sultan of which state the former Dutch Company purchased this monopoly or royalty for 50,000 dollars. By a treaty with the Panambachan made in 1823, all the diamonds must be delivered to government at 20 per cent. below the market price, ascertained by appraisement on the spot, the necessary advances having been previously made to the miners. The small diamonds are sold at Pontianak, and the large ones disposed of at Batavia, and the profits divided between the government and the Panambachan. About 390 carats were found in the latter half of 1823, and 1900 carats in 1824. The quantity found in 1825 and 1826 was less than in 1824.

In his journals,* as published by Captain Mundy and Captain

* *Narrative of Events in Borneo and Celebes*, vol. i. p. 280. 2d Edition. *Keppel's Expedition to Borneo in the Dido*, vol. i. p. 293.

Keppel, Sir James Brooke speaks of his diamond works at Santah, where Palingi Ali assured him he and four men had in one day obtained *sixty* diamonds, some of them of four carats. He mentions his establishment there as consisting of two Banjar diamond workers and six labourers, to whom he added four Chinese for the diamond trench, presided over by Hajji Ibrahim, a Chinese Mohammedan, but he does not say that a single diamond has been found. The diamonds occur in a gravelly stratum, which is laid bare "after the Chinese fashion of trenching the grounds with a run of water through the trench." "The earth is washed at the water's edge in large round wooden pans shaped like shields; and when the diamonds are picked out there remains a residue of black sand like gunpowder, and gold particles."

The fullest and most interesting account of the diamond mines of Borneo has been given by Mr. Hugh Low, Colonial Secretary at Labuh-an.* The diamonds of Borneo, equal to any from India or Brazil in beauty, are found in the greatest quantity in Sango, Landak, and Banjarmasin, where they are worked to a small extent by the Chinese and Malays. Ever since the Malays settled in Borneo, the mines of Landak supplied them with diamonds. The mines of Sango and Banjar have been more recently explored. The principal, and indeed the only mart formerly opened for the Borneo diamonds, was Batavia, and Sir Stamford Raffles says, that "few courts of Europe could perhaps boast of a more brilliant display of diamonds, than in the prosperous days of the Dutch was exhibited by the ladies of Batavia." The Borneo diamonds are found in a gravelly stratum, at various depths below the surface. The mines at Sarawak were formerly worked, but not very extensively. The gravel in which they occur is in some places not more than six feet, and in others as much as eighteen below the surface. They are generally small in size, but of the most brilliant water. Mr. Low saw a person get three small ones at one washing, together with a considerable portion of gold; and Sir James Brooke states that, previous to his time, "eleven men had, in three days, obtained a quantity of diamonds which sold at Sandos (at half their value) for 5000 Java rupees." The great diamond of the Sultan of Mattan, which, as we have already stated, is erroneously supposed not to be a real stone, is, according to Mr. Low, still uncut, and if cut and polished, would be reduced from 367 to 183½ carats, that is, to one half its present size. Its present shape is that of an egg indented on one side. Its value, he says, is stated by Mr. Crawford to be £269,378, being less by £34,822 than that of the Russian diamond, and £119,773 more than that of the Pitt diamond. Mr. Low adds

* *Sarawak, its Inhabitants and Productions*, by Hugh Low, pp. 26-29. London, 1848.

the important statement, that he has been informed "by a person who supposed himself to be a good judge of diamonds, *that the Sultan possesses the real stone,*" (and therefore not a false one as stated in the Singapore Chronicle,) *which he had seen*; but that a crystal is shown to strangers, as the Sultan who has been already robbed of his territory fears that this last emblem of royalty will be also taken from him by his powerful and avaricious neighbours. The Malays of Banjarmasin and Landak have offered to work Sir James Brooke's mines at Sarawak, but their characters are so bad that he does not encourage their immigration. We trust, however, that active means will be taken to explore the valuable treasures in that interesting locality, and that we shall soon be able to announce the arrival of valuable diamonds from a British Colony.*

The discovery of diamonds in Brazil early in the present century, has doubtless led to the abandonment of many of the diamond mines in India. In the mountainous district of Serro do Frio, which is peculiarly celebrated for its diamonds, they are found in rivers or rivulets, in the banks adjoining water courses, and in ravines. The soil with which the diamonds are invariably found intermixed, is called *cascalhao*, which is a stratum of rounded pebbles and gravel, immediately incumbent on the primitive granite, inclining to gneiss, and covered with a stratum of *vegetable* earthy matter of variable thickness. Above the vegetable earth is a stratum called *burgalhao*, which consists of angular quartz pebbles, and not unfrequently large beds of solid quartz not more than four or five inches thick. This stratum, according to Mr. Mawe, does not seem to have been formed at the same time, or by the same means as the *cascalhao*. In the granite beneath the *cascalhao* there is a portion of hornblende and frequently mica. The soil is rich and remarkably ferruginous. In one part of the diamond district of Brazil the *cascalhao* forms a solid conglomerate or breccia of rounded pebbles, cemented by ferruginous matter, and in which the diamonds and gold are frequently enveloped. This pudding-stone is believed by Mr. Mawe to be of very recent formation. In order to obtain the diamonds from the *cascalhao*, the gravelly matter is freed from its adhering earths by the processes which we have already described. Mr. Mawe has given a drawing and description of the diamond workings at Mandango, on the river Fiquitonhoha in the Serro do Frio, where a thousand negroes are employed. The bed of the river is laid dry by an aqueduct, and the water is pumped from the deep pools left in the channel, by means of chain pumps worked by water-wheels. In former times the

* Since this was written, we have learned that the Eastern Archipelago Company have obtained from the Sultan of Borneo the right of working all the mineral productions of his territory.

cascahalao obtained from these pools was carried to the washings by negroes, but it is now conveyed along inclined planes. When a negro finds a diamond of the weight of an 8vo ($17\frac{1}{2}$ carats) the event is celebrated with much ceremony. Crowned with a garland of flowers he is carried in procession to the manager of the washings, who presents him with his freedom, by paying his owner for it. He receives also a present of new clothes, and is permitted to work the mines on his own account. When a stone of 8 or 10 carats is found, the negro receives two new shirts, a complete suit of new clothes, and a handsome knife. For smaller stones of but little value proportionate premiums are given. The diamonds in the treasury of the king amounted in all to about 4000 or 5000 carats, the largest being a fine octohedral one of 17 carats. Diamonds, however, of a much larger size have been found, and one in particular in the alluvium of the river Abaethé, of form approximating to the octohedron, and weighing *seven-eighths* of an oz. troy, or 105 carats, which Mr. Mawe in his *Travels*, from some mistake, says, "is perhaps the largest in the world." In his later work he does not repeat this statement. He says, "that no potentate is so rich in diamonds as the king of Portugal, whose suite, which he had the honour of being shown, he estimated at more than *two millions sterling*." This fine diamond was discovered under very peculiar circumstances. It was found about the year 1797 by three convicts, who were banished into the interior of Brazil, and who when thus driven from society were anxious to obtain a remission of their punishment by the discovery of some new mine or production which the sovereign would value. Influenced by this motive, they wandered for six years through the most unfrequented parts of the country, exposed at one time to the violence of the Anthropophagi, and at another to be seized by the soldiers of the government. As a last resource they explored the bed of the river Abaethé when its waters had been greatly diminished by a long continued drought, and while they were washing its gravel and expecting only gold, they discovered the fine diamond we have mentioned. Uncertain how to act they consulted a clergyman who took them to the governor of Villa Rica, who, as soon as he ascertained that the stone was a real diamond, suspended the sentence of the convicts as a reward for its delivery. The precious gem was sent immediately to Rio Janeiro. A frigate was despatched with it to Lisbon, and the clergyman was also sent to make a proper representation of the case to the Portuguese Government. The sovereign sanctioned the pardon granted by the governor, and Church preferment was given to the clergyman.

The diamond mines of Brazil are stated to have produced only £40,000 per annum. Between 1801 and 1806 the expense

of working them (wages, being about 6d. or 8d. per day) seems to have amounted to £204,000, while the diamonds obtained weighed 115,675 carats, the cost per carat being £1, 13s. 9d. In ordinary years the return of diamonds is only about 20,000 carats.*

Although the diamond district of Minas Geraes, so interesting from its mineral productions, has been visited since the time of Mr. Mawe, by MM. Martius and St. Hilaire, as botanists, and also by M. D'Eschwege, when geology was yet in its infancy, yet it was left to M. Claussen,† who resided twenty years in the country, to survey it with the care which it merits, and particularly in relation to the true matrix of the diamond and the enclase and topaz. The soil which yields diamonds, and has been long known in Brazil, extends into the provinces of Minas and St. Paul, from the 16th to the 26th degree of south latitude. When the diamonds disappear in this last latitude, in the province of St. Paul, the bituminous schists commence, which contain the coal in the province of St. Catherine. In the north of the province of Minas, the red sandstone is covered by a calcareous formation, equivalent to the Jurassic group, and which is itself covered with the gypsum marls with rock salt. In all the parts of this last formation, where the valleys have been excavated sufficiently deep to shew the red sandstone, diamonds are found in the rivers—in the Rio Acary and others.

Early in 1839 diamonds were discovered in the psammite sandstone of the Serro do Santo Antonio de Grammagoa. This mountain consists of large beds of sandstone, which have occasionally the aspect of Itacolumite, but the strata having little inclination, and reposing immediately upon the macignos, (a transition formation,) leave no doubt of their identity with the Psammitic sand-

* "In the diamond districts of Minas Geraes and St. Paul in Brazil examined by Claussen, plutonic forces acting upon dioritic veins have developed in one place common mica, in another ferruginous mica, in the quartzose *itacolumite*. The diamonds of Grammagoa are contained in layers of solid silicic acid. Occasionally they lie enveloped by plates of mica, exactly like the garnets formed in mica slate. The Russian diamonds found in 1829, in the European declivity of the Ural, also stand in geological relation to the black carboniferous dolomite of Adolfskoj, as well as to augitic porphyry, which have not yet been made the subject of sufficiently accurate observations."—*Humboldt's Cosmos*, p. 283. Sir Roderick Murchison and M. Verneuil do not concur in the opinion that the diamonds of Chrestovodaviskensk have had their origin in the black dolomite of that place, for although this rock contains carbon, the alluvia in which the diamonds are found, though overlying the dolomite, have no carbon. They agree rather with Colonel Helmersen that the diamonds like the gold shingle, and the greater part of the accompanying detritus have been drifted from the adjacent flank of the higher mountains, in which micaceous quartz rocks exist, fragments of these (*itacolumite* or micaschist) being also found in the alluvium. See *Geology of Russia*, vol. i. p. 482, note.

† *Notes Géologiques sur la Province de Minas Geraes au Brésil.* Par P. Claussen, de L'Institut Brésilien, 1841. Published in the *Bulletins de L'Académie des Sciences et des Belles Lettres de Bruxelles*. 1841, Tom. viii., part i., pp. 322-343, with four plates.

stones of Abaethé. The first discoverers of these rocks, owing to their being soft, obtained many diamonds from them, but at a greater depth they became harder and more difficult to work. More than 2000 persons rushed to this spot, and working without any plan, they caused a part of the mountain to fall, and by crushing the debris, they found many diamonds. Specimens of the rock with the included diamonds are not very rare. The diamonds are embedded in the Psammite sandstone, and in the Itacolumite sandstone, and sometimes between plates of mica, like the garnets in mica-schist. In the museum of Rio Janeiro there is a large rounded diamond, which has *very distinct impressions of grains of sand*. M. Claussen mentions a specimen of Pseudomorphous sandstone, two inches long and one wide, containing a diamond of nearly two grains, and crystallized in a rounded octohedron,* and also another specimen, the size of the first, of a yellowish sandstone, containing two diamonds, one of which weighs nearly a carat or four grains, and the other one grain. Both of them are crystallized in the perfect primitive octohedron; and M. Claussen has been assured that all the diamonds found in the Itacolumite sandstone are rounded octohedrons, while those found in the Psammite sandstone are perfect octohedrons. M. Claussen has given his views respecting the matrix of the diamond in the following interesting passage:—

“As I had already sent to the museum in Paris in 1838 specimens of red sandstone, as the presumed matrix of the diamond, I shall now explain the reasons which led me to this supposition, and which more recent discoveries have fully confirmed. In studying this subject for many years, I had remarked that the pebbles which are always found in the diamond-bearing *cascalhaos* were—1. Itacolumite (quartzose mica slate); 2. A sandstone, which I then took for a variety of Itacolumite; and, 3. some fragments of jasper; and I found that all other minerals in the *cascalhao* were quite accidental. I therefore believed that Itacolumite was the matrix of the diamond; but was not able to explain the cause of the total absence of the diamond in all the places where this rock was greatly developed. In a journey which I made in 1836 on the left bank of the Rio San Francisco, I visited the diamond-bearing district of Abaethé, and on examining the *cascalhaos* of that river I found it composed nearly thus:—

Pebbles and angular pieces of macignos and petrosiliceous phyl- lades,	.	.	.	4 eighths.
Psammite sandstone and jasper,	.	.	.	2 „
Itacolumite sandstone,	.	.	.	1 „
Quartzose sand, with some grains of menakanite, peridot, garnets, &c.	.	.	.	1 „

“The presence of such a large quantity of macignos is not surprising, because the bed of the river is hollowed out in this formation,

* The owner of this specimen asked 3000 francs for it.

which prevails also in the environs to a great distance. What struck me more was the presence of a considerable quantity of pebbles of Itacolumite sandstone, which I then took for true Itacolumite or quartzose mica-schist, which I knew only *in situ*, at a distance of 50 leagues from this. I then began to think that the macigno formation might rest upon the Itacolumite, and that this ought to exist and be found somewhere in the deep ravines which the waters had excavated in the transition formation. In spite of my researches I found only the latter. I began then to ascend the mountains; and my surprise was great to find deposited here and there on the terraces which skirted them, pebbles and pieces of Itacolumite, of sandstone and of jasper, &c. At last upon the top I found beds of Psammite sandstone resting on the transition formation, with which they have a conformable stratification, and into which they pass gradually. These sandstones contain sometimes veins of jasper, and of jasper agate, and in the same beds they sometimes suddenly change their aspect and structure, and assume those of true Itacolumite, I then instantly recognised the origin of these pebbles, which I had considered as essential to the cascachaos, and I was forced to admit the existence of a secondary Itacolumite posterior to the transition formation, and therefore supposed it to be the primitive matrix of the diamond, which is now confirmed. . . . The diamond is never found enveloped in an earthy crust, as has been stated. Its surface is sometimes rough, but generally smooth. The diamond is easily recognised by putting it into water, for it there preserves its lustre, having the appearance of a bubble of air; whilst all other precious stones lose it."—*Bulletin*, &c. &c., pp. 332-334.

The discovery of diamonds in Russia, far from the tropical zone, has excited much interest among geologists. M. Maurice Engelhardt, who visited the Ural Mountains in 1826, observed the resemblance between the platina sand of that region and that of the diamond districts of Brazil. Humboldt observed a similar resemblance between the Brazilian and Uralian Mountains, and in June 1829 two of his companions, when exploring the western declivity of the Ural range, discovered diamonds. Seven of various sizes were found on the estates of Count Porlier, about 160 miles west of Perm. The Count himself found one in a species of gold and Platinum sand. In the summer of 1830 other seven diamonds weighing from three-eighths of a carat to one carat were found among the gold dust on the same property. In the detritus on the banks of the Adolfskoi, no fewer than forty diamonds have been found in the gold alluvium only twenty feet above the stratum in which the remains of Mammoths and Rhinoceroses are found.* Hence Humboldt has concluded that the formation of gold veins, and consequently of

* These diamonds were seen by Sir Roderick Murchison, in the cabinet of Prince Butera. Since that period Colonel Helmersen has shown that diamonds have been found at three points along the Ural chain, Ekaterineburg Kushvinsk, and Versch-Urals.—*Geology of Russia*, p. 301, note.

diamonds, is comparatively of recent date, and scarcely anterior to the destruction of the Mammoths. Sir Roderick Murchison and M. Verneuil have been led to the same result by different arguments. Colonel Helmersen, who, along with Humboldt and Rose, regard the *Itacolumite* as the real site or matrix of the diamond, discovered that quartzose micaceous schist really occurs in the portion of the Ural adjacent to the diamond mines.

Diamonds have recently been found in Africa, whence they were obtained in ancient times. The museum of M. de Drée contains three diamonds lately purchased at Algiers, and found in washing for gold in the auriferous sands of the River Sumeé, in the Province of Constantine. Mr. Feuchtwanger informs us that Mr. Featherstonhaugh discovered perfect crystallized diamonds, a green and a white one, in N. America, south of the Potomac, and he adds that Mr. Charles Clemson of Philadelphia exhibited to him a diamond found in North Carolina, of a distinct octohedral form, and weighing three grains; but these facts do not seem to be known to, or admitted by, American mineralogists. Mr. Murray mentions on the authority of the Reverend Dr. Robinson of the observatory at Armagh, that a rough diamond with a red tint, and valued by Mr. Rundell at twenty guineas, was found in Ireland in the bed of a brook flowing through the county of Fermanagh. It was brought to a lady resident in the district by a girl, who said that she had picked it up in the bed of the brook.

Having thus submitted to our readers an account of the most celebrated diamond mines in the world, and of the localities in which diamonds are found, we shall proceed to give a description of the largest and finest diamonds of which a correct account has been preserved.

The most noted of all the diamonds, and the one most interesting to Englishmen, is "The Diamond of the Great Mogul," subsequently known by the name of the Koh-i-noor, or Mountain of Light. Tavernier, the celebrated diamond merchant and traveller, was permitted by the Great Mogul to see this diamond and all his other jewels. He was allowed to weigh it, and he found its weight $319\frac{1}{2}$ rattees, which make 279 and $\frac{9}{16}$ ths of our carats, one rattee being seven-eighths of a carat. This stone was part of a larger one found in 1550 in the mine of Gani or Couleur, not far to the east of Golconda, and it came into the possession of the Great Mogul in the following manner:—When Mirgimola, the commander of the forces of the King of Golconda, betrayed his master, he carried off with him this large diamond, and having been kindly welcomed by Shah Jehan, the Great Mogul, he gave it him as a present. It was then rough and uncut, and weighed 907 rattees, which make $787\frac{1}{2}$ carats. "It had," says Tavernier, "three several flaws in it, and if it had been in Europe, it would have been treated in a different manner; for very good pieces would

have been got from it, and it would have remained when cut much heavier; whereas *it has been all ground away*. It was cut by the *Sieur Hortensio Borgis*, a Venetian diamond cutter, who was very ill rewarded for his labour, for when it was cut, they reproached him for having spoiled the stone which ought to have remained of a much greater weight; and instead of paying him for his trouble, the King made them take from him ten thousand rupees, and would have made them take more if he had had more to give." "Had the *Sieur Hortensio*," adds Tavernier, "been well acquainted with his profession, he might have obtained from this great stone some good pieces, without doing any injury to the King, and without having taken so much trouble in grinding it away; but he was not a very skilful diamond cutter."—"After having carefully contemplated," adds Tavernier, "this great stone, and having returned it into the hands of D'Akel Khan, he showed me another diamond, of a pear shape, and of a very good form and fine water, with three other table diamonds, two of them pure, and the other which has small dark points."

Having thus examined and weighed the diamond, Tavernier gives a drawing of it, and describes it as having the form of an egg cut through the middle. He says that it has a fine water, and is round and rose cut, very high on one side, and having on the lower edge a crack and a small flaw within. From this minute account of the Great Mogul diamond, there are certain conclusions that we are entitled to draw.

1. That the great rough diamond, belonging originally to the King of Golconda, and given by Mirjimola to Shah Jehan, was not cut into *two or more pieces* by the Venetian artist, but was *ground down* from 787½ to 279 carats, in consequence of the flaws which it contained. When Tavernier says that Hortensio, had he known his profession, might have obtained some good pieces by cutting the diamond, in place of grinding it down, he does not say this of his own knowledge, because he never saw the large rough diamond, but he says it on the authority of persons who could not but know the fact, and who being interested in blaming the diamond-cutter, could only thus justify their harsh treatment of him, in fining him 10,000 rupees. It is very probable that the flaws rendered it necessary to grind down the diamond, in place of cutting off the parts separated by flaws, as was lately done in the Koh-i-noor, when they were obliged to grind it down to the required shape, in place of cutting off particular portions of it.

2. That the weight of the diamond thus cut was 279 carats, and that its shape was that of half of an egg, as drawn and described by Tavernier, a person thoroughly qualified to weigh, draw, and describe it.

We have been unable to find at what date the diamond of the

Great Mogul, which has the form of a *mountain*, received the name of KOH-I-NOOR, or the *Mountain of Light*. It was certainly not known under that name to the authors of the Hindoo Legends, which allege that it was worn by an Indian warrior who fell in battle in 3001 before Christ! According to the Autobiography of Baber, who became sovereign of Hindostan in 1526, Hamayun, the son of Baber, was sent, after the defeat of Ibrahim Lodi at the battle of Paniput, against Agra, the citadel of which had been held for Ibrahim by Bikermajit, Rajah of Gwalior, who fell in that battle. The family of Bikermajit, as Baber himself relates, were at the time in Agra. Upon Hamayun's arrival they attempted to escape, but were stopped by the parties stationed to watch their movements, and were brought in prisoners. Hamayun would not permit them to be plundered, and of their own free will they presented to him a peshkash (or present), consisting of a quantity of jewels and precious stones, amongst which was *one famous diamond*, which had been acquired by Sultan Ala-ud-din. It is so valuable that a judge of diamonds estimated it at half of the daily expense of the whole world! It is about eight mishkals in weight. On my arrival Hamayun presented it as a peshkash to me, and I gave it back to him as a present.”*

Dr. Horace Wilson, the author of the learned and interesting account of the Koh-i-noor, in the *Official Descriptive and Illustrated Catalogue of the Great Exhibition*,† considers it as very possible that the diamond of Baber was the one which Tavernier saw in the treasury of the Great Mogul. The translators of Baber make eight mishkals equal to 320 rattees, which would give 280 carats as the weight of the diamond, the very same as that of the Great Mogul Diamond; but Dr. Wilson says, that “according to Ferishta, who repeats the story, the weight was eight mishkals or 224 rattees only, which would make it only 491 grains or 125 carats. Baber's expression, however, is ‘ghaliban,’ which would indicate not actual but estimated weight: According to the actual valuation of the Arabian mishkal at 72 grains, the weight of Baber's diamond would be 576 grains, (or 144 carats,) but it is always difficult to fix with precision the value of Indian weights and measures, as they vary at different places and at different times. It is sufficient to determine that Baber obtained a diamond corresponding *nearly if not entirely in weight and value* with one found above a century later in the possession of his descendants. The weight, however, of Baber's diamond being *much the same* as that of Aurungzebe's, (Shah Jehan's brother,) the story of the original weight and the loss in cutting is not to be relied on.”

* *Memoirs of Baber*, translated by Dr. Leyden and Mr. Erskine, p. 308.

† Part III. pp. 695, 696.

These views of Dr. Wilson appear to us quite untenable and even contradictory ; but before we can make our readers understand the question at issue, we must examine Dr. Wilson's opinion that the Mogul Diamond of 279 carats, as weighed by Tavernier, is identical with the present Koh-i-noor weighing 186 carats. To prove this identity, he makes Tavernier ignorant of the value of a rattee, and asserts that it "has been found by trial to be equal to $2\frac{5}{8}$ grains," instead of $3\frac{1}{2}$ grains, as Tavernier assumed. With this value of the rattee, Dr. Wilson makes the Mogul Diamond 175 carats, "which," he says, "is a sufficiently near approximation to the actual weight of the present Koh-i-noor, 186 carats." Now, admitting this low value of the rattee, will any person believe that Tavernier, a skilful diamond merchant, committed a mistake of *eleven carats, or forty grains*, in weighing the Mogul Diamond ? But we cannot admit that Tavernier mistook the value of a rattee. If he did, he must have found all the diamonds which he purchased in India, and resold in Europe, little more than half the weight at which he bought them, having weighed them in India "with the native standard of weight, the rattee," as Dr. Wilson alleges. He must, therefore, have found out his mistake long before he published his *Travels*, and would certainly have corrected it. But, as Dr. Wilson himself tells us, "that Indian weights vary in different places and different times," why do we doubt the accuracy of Tavernier, (who bought diamonds in India by the rattee, and sold them in Europe by the carat,) when he distinctly tells us in his fourteenth chapter, "*On the diversity of weights used at the Diamond Mines,*" &c.,—

"That at the mine of *Sounalpour* in *Bengal* they weigh by ratis, and the rati is seven-eighths of a carat, or three grains and a half. They use the same weights over all the empire of the Mogul."

We are now prepared to come to a decision respecting Baber's diamond. If eight mishkals are equal to 320 rattees, Baber's diamond is so exactly the same weight of the Mogul's, that we can scarcely doubt that they are identical, in which case the story of the cutting of the rough diamond of 793 carats must be false. Yet it is quite possible that there were two diamonds of nearly the same weight, in which case Tavernier's story may be true. But if we do not admit the translator of Baber's value of the mishkal, Baber's diamond must have been either 125 carats or 144, and, consequently, could not have been the Mogul diamond, as reduced to 175 carats by Dr. Wilson, nor the present Koh-i-noor of 186 carats.

Having thus placed it beyond a doubt that the Baber diamond was neither the diamond of Shah Jehan of 279 carats, nor that

of Runjeet Sing, now called the Koh-i-noor, we shall now enter upon the question introduced by Dr. Wilson, where he says, "It still remains to be established how far the great diamond of the Mogul Emperors is to be considered as the same with the Koh-i-noor, *as that appellation is not given to it by the early writers.*"* Now, there are two kinds of evidence which may be adduced for or against the identity of these two diamonds—the testimony of history, and the still more important evidence to be derived from a comparison of their weight and form. There is certainly no distinct evidence that the Mogul diamond passed into the possession of the ruling family of Kabul. That they did possess it is "affirmed by the members of that family, and by the jewellers of Delhi and Kabul," but with such motives to adopt this opinion, who would place any trust in the affirmation either of the family or of the jewellers? It is doubtless true that when Nadir Shah occupied Delhi in 1739, Mohammed Shah, the great-grandson of Aurungzebe, surrendered to him the valuable contents of the imperial treasury, among which "his biographer and secretary specifies a peshkash or present by Mohammed Shah to his conqueror, *of several magnificent diamonds.*" But this surely is no evidence at all that the great historical diamond of India was one of these diamonds. The biographer and secretary of Nadir Shah, who is said to have first used the name of Koh-i-noor, would never have overlooked the "Mountain of Light" among the lesser jewels which composed the peshkash. We regard this therefore as an evidence either that Mohammed Shah did not possess the diamond of his family, or did not surrender it to his conqueror. But it is not improbable, nay, we think it very probable, that the diamond of Runjeet Sing, the present Koh-i-noor of 186 carats, was one of the *magnificent diamonds* referred to, and thus passed downwards through Ahmed Shah and his successors into the hands of Shah Shuja and Runjeet Sing. The historical evidence, therefore, entirely fails in identifying the Koh-i-noor with the diamond of the Great Mogul; nay, we are compelled, by the only part of the evidence which has any real bearing on the question, to infer that Nadir Shah never received from the descendants of Aurungzebe the Great Diamond of his family.

In entire conformity with these views is the physical testimony of weight and form—two sources of evidence which, taken separately, we consider irresistible, and which, when combined, amount

* Dr. Wilson is aware that another value of the rati has been given, namely, $1\frac{5}{8}$ th grains, in which case the Mogul diamond would weigh only 105 carats, and the Baber diamond only 73 or 84 carats, results which he himself will not admit. The rati is the seed of the *abrus piscatorius*, but it is certain that the weight known by this name is heavier than the seed.

to demonstration. Tavernier handled, and weighed, and delineated, and described the Mogul Diamond. Its weight was $279\frac{9}{16}$ carats—its form that of *half an egg*; it is of a *good shape*—it is *round rose-cut*, as elsewhere expressed, “there is a little flaw in the edge of *the cutting below, which goes round about the stone.*” With this description the drawing perfectly agrees. Now the Koh-i-noor weighed only 186 carats; its form had not the least resemblance to half an egg; it was not round rose-cut; it was not of a good shape, but of a singularly bad one; and it had not the slightest resemblance to Tavernier’s drawing. We have already seen how Dr. Wilson meets the argument from weight, and we trust we have satisfactorily answered it. We may now add that Tavernier’s drawings of different diamonds are to a scale, along with diamonds sold to the King of France, by the carat; and by this scale the diamond of the Mogul, in place of being 175 carats, has the appearance of 279. But not only is the Koh-i-noor in every respect dissimilar to the Mogul diamond, the two cannot be identified even by supposing that the 279 carats have been reduced to 286 by cutting off a slice of 93 carats, ($279-186=93$.) because it is *impossible* to convert the Koh-i-noor into the Mogul diamond, by adding 93 carats to it, even in the smallest pieces or particles; and, of course, equally impossible to reduce the Mogul diamond into the Koh-i-noor by cutting a slice from it, or even by grinding it down.

This observation is of importance in reference to a theory brought forward by Dr. Beke in a notice read at the Ipswich meeting of the British Association, “*on a Diamond Slab supposed to have been cut from the Koh-i-noor.*”

“It appears,” says Dr. Beke,* “that in 1832 the Persian army, under Abbas Meerza, Hereditary Prince of Persia, for the subjugation of Khorassan, found at the capture of Coocha, among the jewels of the harem of Reeza Kooli Khan, the chief of that place, a large diamond slab, supposed to have been cut from the Koh-i-noor. It weighed 180 carats, and shewed the marks of cutting on the flat or largest side. The only account that could be obtained of it was the statement that it was found in the possession of a poor man, a native of Khorassan, and that it had been employed in his family for the purpose of striking a light against a steel, and in this rough service it had sustained injury by constant use. The diamond was presented by Abbas Meerza to his father, Futteh Ali Shah, and is presumed to be among the crown jewels of Persia. The Armenian jewellers of Teheran asked the sum of 20,000 tomanas (£16,000 sterling) for cutting it, but the Shah was not inclined to incur the expense.”†

* Athenæum, July 5, 1851, p. 718; and Report of the British Association, 1851, p. 44.

† The above particulars were forwarded to Dr. Beke by his brother, Mr. William

This new theory of the Koh-i-noor, is obviously in favour of our views, in so far as it shows that the relationship between it and the Mogul diamond can only be ascertained by supposing the one to be a portion of the other. The two portions, however, are unfortunately larger than the whole, for $186 + 130$ carats, are equal to 316 carats, $36\frac{1}{2}$ carats heavier than the Mogul diamond. The Persian stone, too, of 130 carats, must have been heavier before it was worn by the steel, and a considerable number of carats must have been removed by the cutting; so that we may estimate the difference between the great diamond and its two halves at nearly 50 carats, a difference which cannot be admitted. Besides, the large flat face of the Koh-i-noor is one of the natural faces of the octohedron, and it is not likely that a diamond cutter would have cut so accurately in that place.

In order to remove the objection on the ground of weight, Mr. James Tennant, mineralogist to the Queen, has proposed a new and very ingenious theory, according to which the Koh-i-noor formed part of a larger stone which had been split into *three* pieces by *two* cleavage planes. The original rough diamond of the King of Golconda, of 793 carats, he supposes to have been split into the Great Mogul diamond of 279 carats, the Koh-i-noor of 186, and a *third* now among the crown jewels of Russia, the weight of which he has not been able to ascertain, but which must not exceed 328 carats, even if the great stone was split without loss. We have now before us a model explaining this theory, kindly sent us by Mr. Tennant. The original crystal is assumed to be the regular rhombic dodecahedron. The *first* slice is supposed to be "The Koh-i-noor," as diminished since it was weighed by Tavernier. It is cut from the dodecahedron by a broad plane parallel to a face of the octohedron. The *second* or inner slice next to this is also supposed to have been split from the Koh-i-noor, since it was seen by Tavernier. It is bounded by planes parallel to the face of the octohedron, and we presume that Mr. Tennant considers this slice as that mentioned by Dr. Beke, as among the crown jewels of Persia. The *third* or outer slice is supposed to be the Russian Diamond. We have also before us a drawing of the original rhombic dodecahedron by the Reverend Mr. Mitchell, with separate drawings of the three slices, and we willingly admit that this is the only method by which the Mogul diamond of 279, and the present Koh-i-noor of 186 carats, can be placed in crystallographic relationship. The truth of the theory, however, is another matter, and will speedily be tested, for Mr. Tennant has written to St.

Beke, late Colonel of Engineers in the Persian service, who took part in the Khorrassan campaign.

Petersburgh for the weight and form of the Russian diamond, and the Persian Ambassador, Sheffee Khan, has kindly written to Persia for models of the royal diamond for our information. If the weights and planes of cleavage thus obtained are reconcilable with Mr. Tennant's theory, the coincidence, like many other coincidences, will be a very remarkable one; but, like the facts of clairvoyance and other apparently supernatural events, we never can regard it as anything but a coincidence. We have the highest evidence that the great rough diamond of 793 carats was never cut in pieces, but ground down to 279 carats; and when we consider that Tavernier himself knew Mirgimola personally, and even visited him,—that he learned the facts of the grinding down of the diamond, and of the fining of the diamond cutter for doing this, not from tradition, but from the parties who were present, and who had no possible motive to deceive him, we must receive his testimony as overbearing any evidence of a physical kind.

It is obvious, we think, from the facts submitted to the reader, that there is no satisfactory evidence that the diamond of 279 carats, either in its unity or in its twin condition, came into the possession of Shah Shuja. We are willing, however, to believe the prevailing tradition, that he did possess either the original stone weighed by Tavernier, or the present Koh-i-noor, or both. • It seems quite certain that the latter is the diamond which he surrendered to Runjeet Sing, and it has been confidently asserted by many gentlemen from India, that the Mogul diamond is still in that country; and if this is true, we have no means of ascertaining if it was ever in the hands of the Cabul family, or if it was retained by Shah Shuja when he presented an inferior one to the Lion of the Punjab. There have been different accounts of the way in which this valuable gem came into the hands of Runjeet. The following account given by Dr. Wilson is probably the most correct. •

“ When Shah Shuja was driven from Kabul, he became the nominal guest and actual prisoner of Runjit Sing, who spared neither opportunity nor menace, until, in 1813, he compelled the fugitive monarch to resign the precious gem, presenting him on the occasion, it is said, with a lakh and 25,000 rupees, or about £12,000 sterling. According to Shah Shuja's own account, however, he assigned to him the revenues of three villages, not one rupee of which he ever realized. Runjit was highly elated by the acquisition of the diamond, and wore it as an armlet at all public festivals. When he was dying, an attempt was made by persons about him to persuade him to make the diamond a present to Jagannath, and it is said he intimated, by an inclination of his head, his assent. The treasurer, however, in whose charge it was, refused to give it up without some better

warrant, and Runjit dying before a written order could be signed by him, the Koh-i-noor was preserved for a while for his successors. It was occasionally worn by Khurruk Sing and Shir Sing. After the murder of the latter, it remained in the Lahore Treasury until the supercession of Dhulip Sing, and the annexation of the Punjab by the British Government, when the civil authorities took possession of the Lahore Treasury, under the stipulation previously made, that all the property of the State should be confiscated to the East India Company, in part payment of the debt due by the Lahore government, and of the expenses of the war. It was at the same time stipulated that the Koh-i-noor should be surrendered to the Queen of England. The diamond was conveyed to Bombay by Governor-General the Earl of Dalhousie, whom ill health had compelled to repair to the coast, and was thus given in charge to Lieut.-Col. Mackeson, C.B., and Capt. T. Ramsay, the Military Secretary to the Governor-General, to take to England. These officers embarked on board Her Majesty's steam-ship *Medea*, and left Bombay on the 6th of April 1850. They arrived at Portsmouth on the 30th of June, and two days afterwards relinquished their charge to the chairman and deputy-chairman of the Court of Directors, by whom, in company with the President of the Board of Control, the Koh-i-noor was delivered to Her Majesty on the 3d of July—an appropriate and honourable close to its eventful career."

The history of the Koh-i-noor, since it came into the possession of Her Majesty, is known to most of our readers. It was seen by thousands at the Great Exhibition, but owing to the manner in which it was cut, and to the great breadth of light which was incident upon its facets from the glass roof of the Crystal Palace, it exhibited less lustre and fewer colours than its glass models. But when fifteen or sixteen gas lights were placed behind it, which was done upon our recommendation, it threw out the most brilliant flashes of coloured light, which delighted those who took the trouble of moving their head into different positions in order to catch the refracted pencils which corresponded to the different jets of light by which it was shewn.

As the Koh-i-noor in the state in which it reached England was of no value as an ornamental gem, it was Her Majesty's wish to have it recut into such a form as would display its intrinsic beauty, and make it a true ornament. After consulting persons qualified to give an opinion respecting the best form to be given to it, it was entrusted to Mr. Garrard the Crown jeweller, who by a process of cutting which we shall by and by describe, has rendered it one of the finest ornamental diamonds which exists in Europe.

As the origin and growth of the diamond is one of the most perplexing and interesting questions in modern science, Sir David Brewster, who had devoted much time to the study of the

structure and properties of that body, was anxious to examine such a large mass as the Koh-i-noor, before it was reduced in size, and unfitted for examination by the new form which was to be given it. Having been consulted by His Royal Highness Prince Albert respecting the form into which it should be cut, he received permission to examine it in its entire state; and in a future part of this Article we shall give a brief account of the experiments which he made, and of the views to which they conducted him.

The next diamond which claims our attention is the Pitt or Regent Diamond, which, in its rough state, as brought from Golconda, weighed 410 carats, and 136 $\frac{7}{8}$ when cut. It was purchased by Thomas Pitt, when governor of Fort-George, Madras, in December 1701, who states that when it was brought to him as a large rough stone it weighed 305 mangelins, or nearly 420 carats, reckoning a mangelin equal to 1 $\frac{3}{8}$ carats. He paid for it 48,000 pagodas, or £20,400, reckoning the pagoda at 8s. 6d. It was cut into a fine brilliant, in the shape of an obtuse quadrangle, one inch and two lines long, one inch one and a-half lines broad, and ten lines thick. The cutting of it occupied two years, and the expense thus incurred was, according to one account, £3666, and others, £5000.* It was purchased in 1717, in the minority of Louis XV., by the Duke of Orleans, when Regent of France, and thus got the name of the Regent Diamond. This diamond is allowed to be the finest in the world, (though not the largest,) in beauty of form and in the purity of its water. Jeffries informs us that it has only one small foul speck in it, which cannot be seen when the stone is set. The Kings of France wore this diamond in their hats, and Napoleon had it fixed in the pommel of his sword; but it was subsequently transferred to the French crown, where it presides over 5300 of the finest brilliants, weighing together 1738 carats, and 96 of the most perfect sapphires, weighing 711 carats. The crown was made by M. Pabst, a native of Germany, and jeweller to the King. According to Patrin this diamond was carried to Berlin, which corresponds with a report mentioned by Mr. Murray, that "it was played with such success before the king of Prussia, by the wily Sieyes, as to produce for the service of France 40,000 horses with their equipments." Mr. Murray was also informed that Charles X. tried to carry it off, and "that it was taken from his person on leaving France." According to one statement, it was valued in 1791, by a commission of jewellers, at twelve millions of livres; and according to a MS. now

* The chips and filings, amounting to nearly two-thirds of the original stone, were valued at nearly £8000.

before us, at £458,333, which is nearly the amount of twelve million of livres.

The next diamond in point of size and beauty is that of the Rajah of Mattan, in Borneo, which we have already mentioned in our account of the diamond mines of that island. It was, according to Sir Stamford Raffles, found about the close of the last century, by a Dayak, and claimed as a droit of royalty by Guru Layo, the sultan of the country, but was handed over to the Pangeran of Landak, whose brother having got possession of it, gave it as a bribe to the Sultan of Succadana, in order that he might be placed on the throne of Landak. The lawful prince, however, having fled to Bantam, by the aid of the prince of that country and the Dutch, he succeeded in regaining possession of his district, and nearly destroyed Succadana. Sir Stamford Raffles adds, that it has remained an heir-loom in the family for four descents, and is almost the only appendage of royalty now remaining.* The Mattan diamond is said to be of the finest water, and to weigh 367 carats.† Sir Stamford Raffles says that it was *uncut* when he wrote, but since it is now cut, (as we infer from a drawing of its superficies, in which the facets are placed with great symmetry and beauty,) we have no means of ascertaining how much it may have been reduced in weight. Many years ago the Governor of Batavia was anxious to purchase it. He sent Mr. Stewart to Borneo, to offer for it to the Rajah 150,000 dollars, two large war-brigs, with their guns and ammunition, and a large quantity of powder and shot. But as the fortunes of the family are believed to depend upon the possession of the diamond, and as the Malays regard it as possessing the miraculous power of curing all kinds of diseases by means of the water in which the diamonds are dipped, the Rajah refused to deprive the family of so rich an inheritance, and his people of so valuable a medicine.

Though an inferior stone, the one next in weight to the preceding is the largest table diamond in the world. It weighs 242 carats and 5-16ths. Tavernier saw it at Golconda in 1642, and says that "it was the biggest he ever saw in his life in a merchant's hands." It was valued at 500,000 rupees, or 750,000 livres. He offered 400,000 rupees for it, but could not get it at that price. In a MS. before us, it is said to be remarkable for its purity, but inferior in shape, regular cut, and brilliancy, to the stones already mentioned. It is of a rectangular form, with one of its angles cut off. Its length is two inches, its breadth one inch and one line, and its thickness three lines only. Its upper surface has four facets, one on each edge, and it is quite flat be-

* History of Java, vol. i. p. 266

† Memoirs of the Batavian Society.

low. Hence, as the writer of the MS. observes, it has no better appearance than a piece of the purest rock crystal. It was sold, he adds, for £4000, but he does not say to whom, and we have not been able to discover its purchaser or its present locality.

The next largest diamond is one which belongs to the king of Persia. Its weight, as we learn from the Persian ambassador, is 232 carats, and it is known by the name of the *Deria-i-noor*, or *the Sea of Light*. In the East India Company's office in Leadenhall Street, there is a portrait of the king of Persia, the grandfather of the present king, in which the *Deria-i-noor* may be seen placed on his right arm.

The great diamond in the sceptre of the Emperor of Russia, which has been called the *Effingham* diamond, was brought to England by the Earl of Effingham while Governor-General of India. We cannot discover how it left England, but it is said to have been purchased by a Jew for £17,000 or £18,000. After having frequently changed hands it came into the possession of a Greek merchant, Gregory Suffras, (another account says an American merchant named Luzauf,) from whom it was purchased by Prince Orloff for the Empress Catherine of Russia, who gave for it £84,500, and an annuity of £3660, together with a patent of nobility. It now adorns the imperial sceptre of Russia, being placed immediately beneath the golden eagle which surmounts it. This diamond was one of the eyes of an idol of Malabar, called *Scheringham*. A French grenadier who had deserted from the Indian service contrived to become one of the inferior priests of the idol, and having secreted himself in the temple, he stole its diamond eye. He then went to the English camp at Trichinopoly, and afterwards to Madras, where a ship captain bought it for 20,000 rupees. Its weight is $194\frac{3}{4}$ carats. Its shape is a circular pyramid, with five concentric rows of facets: At the top of the pyramid the facets are sectors of a circle, sixteen in number, meeting in the centre or summit of the pyramid. Its base forms a rhomboid, whose greatest length is 1 inch and 4 lines, and its thickness 10 lines.

Tavernier gives a drawing of a diamond which he bought at Amadabad, and which weighed $157\frac{1}{4}$ carats. It has a sort of pear shape, with a deep rounded groove along its whole length, with seven black specks and three triangular black cavities. How he disposed of it is not mentioned, and where it is now we cannot discover.

The fine diamond which originally belonged to the Grand Duke of Tuscany has been drawn by Tavernier. Its weight is $139\frac{1}{2}$ carats, and the fault of it, he says, is, that the water of it inclines somewhat to a citron colour. It passed into the hands

of the Emperor of Austria,* and is now exhibited in the imperial treasury at Vienna, where it attracts universal admiration. It is not regularly cut, and has neither the proper form of a rose nor that of a brilliant. Its lustre and brilliancy are greatly increased by its star-like cut, and though tinged with a shade of yellow it is, from its form and weight, one of the rarest specimens of its kind. It is 1 inch 2 lines long, and one inch broad. It is surrounded with other fine brilliants, and neatly mounted in a large *sevigné*. Its value is estimated at £90,000.

The discovery of the *Abaéthé* diamond in Brazil has been already mentioned. Mr. Mawe in one place says, that its weight was nearly an ounce Troy, and in another *seven-eighths* of an ounce, (105 carats,) and yet he states in the same paragraph what is entirely inconsistent with this weight, that it “is perhaps the largest diamond in the world.” In his *Treatise on Diamonds*, published eleven years afterwards, he repeats the statement of its being in the rough nearly an ounce Troy in weight. This diamond is not even mentioned by Mr. Murray; but he describes another diamond under the same name of the *Abaéthé* diamond, and connects with its discovery the very same story of the three convicts which Mr. Mawe tells in reference to the diamond of an ounce Troy. Mr. Murray describes it as the largest in the world—the size of an ostrich egg, and weighing 1680 carats! *Romé de L’Isle* in his *Treatise on Crystallographie*, published in 1783, says, that “the most extraordinary stone which has been obtained from the mines of Brazil is a diamond (some pretend that it is a white topaz) which the present king of Portugal possesses, and which weighs 1680 carats, (*c’est à dire onze onces, cinq gros, vingt quatre grains.*) Besides this diamond, which is preserved rough,” he adds, “this sovereign possesses another of less size but of rare beauty, which weighs 215 carats, and is consequently one of the largest that is known.”† Mr. Murray mentions this diamond of 215 carats, under the name of the *Round Brilliant* of Portugal, which he says is extremely fine, and has been estimated at £388,290. *Romé de L’Isle* says that the figure and size of the great diamond of 1680 carats is given in the *Journal (Económique)*,‡ and he values it at £224,000,000 sterling, whereas, according to *Jeffries’* rule it should be only £5,644,800. Mr. Murray says, that “Mr. Mawe, who had attentively examined it, informed him that he considered it to be a *white topaz*, and not a diamond,” which we have no doubt is true.

The *Sancy* diamond, the product of the Indian mines, was

* *Journal Historique et Politique de Genere*, 28th February 1775, p. 316.

† *Crystallographie*. 2d Edition. Vol. ii. p. 208. Paris, 1783.

‡ July 1781, p. 111.

brought to France by Baron de Sancy, who was the French ambassador at Souleure. Its weight is $53\frac{1}{2}$ carats, and, according to Duteus,* cost £25,000, which was far below its value. It is what is called a brislet, that is, pear shaped, and covered on both sides with triangular rose facets, the effect of which method of cutting is to diminish greatly the value which it would otherwise have derived from its great purity and fine water. The following history of it is given by Mr. Murray:—

“ This diamond was originally brought from India, and has remained in France for the last four centuries. Charles the Bold, Duke of Burgundy, wore it in his helmet at the battle of Nancy, near the Lake Morat, in Switzerland, in 1475, and in which he fell. He is represented in the vignette of a MS. in the Bibliothèque Royale, wearing in his hat that which was afterwards taken in his baggage by the Swiss, after the battle of Grandison. It was found by a Swiss soldier among the spoils of the battle, and sold to a priest for a florin (1s. 8d.), who afterwards disposed of it for three francs (2s. 6d.) We subsequently, in the year 1489, trace the Sanci diamond to the possession of Antonio, King of Portugal, who being in want of money, first pledged it for 40,000 livres, and afterwards disposed of it entirely for the sum of 100,000 livres, to a French gentleman of the name of De Sanci. Nicolas Harlai de Sanci had it afterwards by succession. At the time of the Baron de Sanci's embassy at Souleure, Henry III. requiring money to recruit his forces, borrowed the diamond in order to pledge it for a sum of money, and it was entrusted to a confidential servant who was waylaid and assassinated by a band of robbers. The body, however, after some search, was found buried in a wood, and on being opened, discovered the gem, the servant having swallowed it at the first onset. Baron de Sanci afterwards disposed of it to James II. of England, in 1688, when he had escaped to France, and remained at St. Germain. From him it passed to Louis XIV., and Louis XV. wore it in his hat at his coronation. Its form is somewhat pear shaped, and is of the purest brilliancy.”

This fine diamond has been lately purchased by Count Demidoff, the Grand Almoner of the Emperor of Russia, for 500,000 rubles.

The *Nussac* Diamond, weighing, according to one account, $89\frac{3}{4}$ carats, and according to another $79\frac{1}{2}$, was captured during the Mahratta war in India, in the Peishwa's baggage, by the combined armies under the Marquis of Hastings. It is said to have been presented by the Marquis, as from himself, to the East India Company, but it was afterwards given up to form part of the Deccan booty. It remained ten years in the possession of Rundell and Bridge, and was purchased at a public sale in 1837 by Emanuel Brothers, for £7200, scarcely one-third of its estimated value.

The Nussac diamond, and the diamond ear-rings, weighing 56 carats, and purchased for £11,000, were sold by him to the Marquis of Westminster, in whose possession they now are. The form of this diamond is triangular, and it has been cut and polished so as to retain the greatest possible weight.

The Pigott Diamond, not now in existence, was "a brilliant of great surface both in table and girdle," and from its superior water was the finest in Europe. Its weight was $47\frac{1}{2}$ carats. In 1801 it was sold by lottery for £30,000. It became the property of a young man, who sold it at a low price. It was again disposed of, and Rundell and Bridge, into whose possession it afterwards came, sold it for the same sum to Ali Pacha, who always wore it in a green silk purse attached to his girdle. Mr. Murray informs us, "that when Ali Pacha was mortally wounded by Reschid Pacha, he immediately retired to his Divan, and desired that his favourite wife Vasilika should be poisoned, and he gave the diamond to Captain D'Anglas, with orders that it should be crushed to powder in his presence, which was forthwith done, and the beautiful gem utterly destroyed. Vasilika still lives, but the model of the diamond alone remains. The too obedient officer bitterly regretted his folly, and the destroyed diamond haunted him in his dreams for months afterwards."

The Vienna Rose Diamond is considered a remarkable specimen of large diamonds. It has the form of a square truncated at the angles. Its length is 1 inch 3 lines, its breadth 1 inch 2 lines, and it is very thick in the girdle. The upper face of the stone is flat, but not rising into a crown, as is invariably the case in a fine regularly cut Dutch Rose Diamond. Owing to these imperfections, its beauty is now less than might be expected from a brilliant of the same size. Its weight is 96 carats, and its estimated value £15,000.

In the King of Saxony's Repository at Dresden, called the Green Vault, there is a diamond called the Saxon White Brilliant, of considerable size and great beauty. It is of the first water, perfectly transparent, and of a pleasing form. It glitters and sparkles with unusual brilliancy of colour. It adorns the insignia of the order of the Gold Fleece, and is surrounded with other fine brilliants. It is 1 inch and 1 line square. It weighs $48\frac{3}{4}$ carats, and from its fine shape and great perfection, it is said to have been purchased by King Augustus for £143,833.

We have already mentioned the *Deria-i-noor*, or the *Sea of Light*, as weighing 232 carats. Mr. Murray says that its weight is 186, and that it is placed in a pair of bracelets valued at nearly a million sterling, along with the *Taj-e-Mah*, or *Crown of the Moon*, which weighs 146 carats. The Persian crown

contains two diamonds of great size and value, namely, the *Sea of Glory*, weighing 66 carats, and valued at £34,848, and the *Mountain of Splendour*, weighing 135 carats, and valued at £145,800.

Our limits will not permit us to describe any of the colourless diamonds of inferior weight and value. We must, however, call the attention of our readers to the most interesting coloured diamonds which are known to exist. The value of a diamond is greatly enhanced if it is either *pink*, *blue*, or *green*. The *yellow* colour, which is not prized, passes into wine colour, and through cinnamon brown into black. The pale green passes into yellowish green, the bluish grey into Prussian blue, and the pink into rose red.

Such of our readers as visited the Great Exhibition of 1851 must have seen and admired the fine *blue* diamond of Mr. Hope which was exhibited in the gallery. To use the words of Mr. Hertz, this diamond is "a most magnificent and rare brilliant of a deep sapphire blue, of the greatest purity, and most beautifully cut: it is of true proportions, not too thick nor too spread. This matchless gem combines the beautiful colour of the sapphire with the prismatic fire and brilliancy of the diamond, and on account of its extraordinary colour, great size, and other fine qualities, it certainly may be called *unique*, as we may presume that there exists no cabinet, nor any collection of crown jewels in the world which can boast of the possession of so curious and fine a gem."* This diamond is mounted as a medallion with a border of small rose diamonds, surrounded by twenty brilliants, of the finest water and equal size, shape, and cutting, and averaging one carat each. The weight is forty-four carats, and the price once asked for it was £30,000. We are informed by Mr. Tennant that Mr. Hope gave £13,000 for it, and that it had been several times pledged for a much larger sum, viz., £15,000, and that £16,000 had been lent upon it. Messrs. Rundell and Bridge regarded this as the finest blue diamond ever known, and Mr. Mawe on referring to it calls it "a superlatively fine blue diamond, which may be considered matchless."

Other three blue diamonds have been mentioned or described. One of these is a rich *sky blue* brilliant belonging to the crown jewels of France. It weighs 67 $\frac{2}{10}$ th carats, and has been valued at three millions of livres: another, of a splendid blue colour, and of great beauty and rarity, was purchased by George IV. from Mr. Eliason. It weighs 44 $\frac{1}{2}$ carats, cost £22,000, and was the principal ornament of the crown on the day of his corona-

* *Catalogue of Mr. Hope's Collection*, p. 25.

tion. The third blue diamond, called the “Blue Brilliant of Bavaria,” is in the Royal Treasury at Munich. It is a perfectly regular *treble** cut brilliant. Its length is one inch, its breadth ten lines, and its weight thirty-six carats. The colour varies from the soft velvet blue of a perfect sapphire to the colour of steel. It is quite pure, and sparkles with the highest lustre. It is surrounded with beautiful white brilliants, in the Order of the Golden Fleece.

In the King of Saxony’s Green Vault at Dresden, there is a large green diamond, which, in point of brilliancy and purity, is said to surpass every other known green diamond. It is cut into an oblong form. Its length is one inch and one line, its breadth ten lines, and its weight forty carats. It is mounted on a clasp, and is set round with large white brilliants. The price paid for this gem is kept a profound secret.

The Vienna *Rose* coloured diamond is one inch long, and nine lines broad. It weighs thirty-two carats, and has the shape of an obtuse oval. It is a regularly cut brilliant, and is of the finest rose colour and the greatest lustre. It is set in the middle of a knot of white brilliants, to which the decoration of the cross of Maria Theresa is attached.

Having thus given a history and description of the various diamond mines in different parts of the world, and of the finest diamonds which they have yielded, we shall now proceed to give a brief account of the form, the composition, the structure, and the origin of this singular body.

Like all other crystallized bodies, the diamond is found in two different conditions, the one amorphous or shapeless, like a pebble water-worn, or rounded by attrition in the bed of a stream,—the other a geometrical solid of great beauty, sometimes with its planes or faces rounded, as in the spheroidal diamond, and sometimes with its faces smooth and flat. These crystals are sometimes composed of two, and are then called hemitrope or twin crystals, and sometimes of a great number aggregated together, and yet the whole mass preserving the general form of a single crystal.† The general forms of the diamond are the cube, the regular octohedron, and the dodecahedron, the first with *four* faces, the second with *eight*, and the *third* with twelve. The second of these forms may be produced from the first, by cutting off all its *four* angles, till the faces of the cube disappear, and the solid thus produced is the octohedron, or the primitive form

* A brilliant is said to be *treble* cut when the large facets on its side are flattened or cut into two smaller facets.

† This is finely seen in a specimen now before us, belonging to Mr. Tennant.

of the diamond, *i.e.*, every diamond may be reduced by cleavage to this form. The inclination of the faces of the octohedron to each other is $109^{\circ} 28' 16''$, and that of the faces of the octohedron to the faces of the cube, $125^{\circ} 15' 52''$.

It has been long known that the diamond, unlike all mineral bodies whatever, consists of vegetable matter which can be burned. Sir Isaac Newton had conjectured from its high refractive power, that the diamond was "an unctuous substance coagulated," and in 1694 a diamond of nearly 8 carats was so volatilized by a burning glass at Florence that the pieces into which it broke were dissolved. The same experiment has been often repeated, and in our own day Sir H. Davy, with the Grand Duke of Tuscany's burning glass, found that a diamond introduced into a glass globe supplied with oxygen, and kindled by the solar rays, continued to burn after it was removed from the focus. Carbonic acid gas was the exclusive result of the experiment. Sir George Mackenzie of Coul was the first person in this country who burned diamonds, making a free use of his mother's jewels; and by means of diamond powder he converted iron into steel. Mr. Smithson Tennant, the founder of the Smithsonian Institution in America, volatilized a diamond in a gold tube with a stream of oxygen, and found that the oxygen gas was transformed into an equal volume of *carbonic acid gas*. The diamond is therefore pure *carbon*, and hence various attempts have been made to make artificial diamonds, but hitherto without success. About twenty-five years ago M. Cagnard de la Tour announced that he had formed a diamond by crystallizing charcoal, but M. Thenard found that the crystals were only silicates.* As M. Ebelman has succeeded in making several minerals and gems by an artificial process, such as perowskite, glucine, rutile, spinelle, ruby, peridot or chrysolite, and cymophane or chrysoberyl,† we may reasonably expect that the other precious stones, and the diamond itself, will yield to the advancing science of the age.‡

In its physical properties, as well as in its commercial value, the diamond transcends all the other gems. It is the hardest of all mineral bodies, scratching zircon, sapphire, ruby, rock-crystal, and all the gems, and cannot be scratched by any of them. The specific gravity of water being 1, that of diamond is 3.55, that is, a cubical inch of diamond would be equal in weight to a little more than $3\frac{1}{2}$ cubic inches of water. Its *re-*

* See *Edinburgh Journal of Science*, 1827, vol. x. p. 369.

† See *Comptes Rendus*, &c., 1851, tom. xxxii. p. 330, 710, 713, and tom. xxxiii. p. 525.

‡ M. Despretz, a distinguished Member of the Institute of France, is specially occupied with this class of experiments.

fractive powers, that is, its power to bend a ray of light incident obliquely upon its surface, is 2·439, that of water being 1·336, and glass 1·500; but in this respect it is surpassed by octohedrite, artificial Realgar and Greenockite. Its power of *dispersing* a ray of white light, that is, of separating it into its component colours in reference to its refractive power, is only 0·038, whereas plate glass is 0·052, and oil of cassia 0·139, so that in this respect it is inferior to a vast number of fluids as well as solids. It is a curious fact, which we believe has not been noticed by optical writers, that this inferiority of dispersive power is necessary to the production of those splendid coloured refractions to which it owes all its value as an ornamental gem. Its high refractive power separates the red and blue rays more than a high dispersive does in most other bodies, and sufficiently to give each colour of the spectrum its full force. Had its dispersive power, on the other hand, been greater, the colours would have been widely separated, and proportionally diluted or weakened in intensity, and the green and blue rays would, in many of the most inclined facets, have been unable to emerge from the front surface of the stone. Hence the superiority of the diamond, as an ornamental gem, depends not only on its high refractive power, which alone separates the colours of white light to a very great degree, but also on its low dispersive power which prevents them from being separated too much, and detained as it were within the stone, or rather, prevented from emerging from it after reflection.

A part of the beauty of the diamond, but only a small part of it, depends upon the great quantity of white light which is reflected from the outer surface of its facets, and gives it a sort of metallic or adamantine lustre. It is obvious, however, that if no light were thus reflected, and if it all entered the stone, and therefore suffered refraction, we should have the same quantity of light reflected back again in a coloured state, rather than in the state of white light. This property, which belongs to all bodies of a high refractive power, of reflecting much light both when it enters and quits them, has the effect of making the most transparent and perfectly colourless specimens of diamond, that is, those of the *purest water*, as it is technically expressed, less transparent than either pure water or pure glass; because the quantity of light reflected from the two surfaces of a plate of diamond is taken from the quantity transmitted, so that, were such a thing possible, a window glazed with plates of diamond would make a darker room than one glazed with colourless glass.

The diamond exhibits vitreous electricity, that is, the same as glass by friction, and it is stated, though we have not succeeded in confirming the statement, that when a diamond is held *for an*

instant in the pure light, it exhibits a phosphorescence which lasts a considerable time. It is not improbable that this effect may be produced by the impression of light upon the retina, which continues for the third of a second, and that the subsequent luminous appearance may be the accidental or complementary colour in the observer's eye.

We come now to the most important part of our subject, to an examination of the internal structure of the diamond, as compared with that of other gems, and to explain some very simple and infallible methods of distinguishing the diamond from all other precious stones, and from artificial imitations of it; and also of distinguishing the precious stones from one another, and from the coloured glass imitations of them with which they are so often confounded.

In order that the general reader may peruse these pages with some degree of intelligence, we may remark that, within the last forty years, very remarkable properties of light have been discovered, which enable us to study the interior structure of organized bodies, whether they belong to the animal, the vegetable, or the mineral world. The light, which puts this power into our hands, is called *polarized* light, and is distinguished from common light by peculiar properties. The light of the sun, and moon, and of all flames is *common* light; but when these lights are reflected from the surface of transparent solids or fluids, at angles varying with the nature of the body, from 50° to 68° , they are by this reflection converted into *polarized* light.

When we transmit light, whether *common* or *polarized*, through a piece of well annealed glass, it suffers no change, and we see no structure in the glass different from what we would see if we looked through pure water. But if we make heat pass through the glass, by placing the edge of the plate of glass upon a heated iron, or if we either bend or compress the glass by mechanical force, its structure, or the mechanical condition of its particles, will be changed. If we now transmit *common* light through the glass thus changed, the change will not be visible; but if we transmit *polarized* light through it, and again analyze that light by reflection from a transparent body at an angle between 50° and 68° , and in a plane at right angles to that in which the common light was reflected and polarized, the observer, looking through the glass, will see the most brilliant colours, indicating the effects of the compressing or dilating forces, or of the contracting or expanding cause,—the degrees of compression or dilatation, of contraction or expansion being indicated by the colours displayed at particular parts of the glass. In this way polarized light enables us to discover that certain portions of a body have been subject to certain mechanical forces, the nature of which

must be sought for in the circumstances under which the body has been originally formed, or in which it has been subsequently placed.

In applying this principle to the examination of transparent solids, such as gums, resins, glass, minerals, and precious stones, we are met with a difficulty which it is sometimes impossible to surmount. We can easily shape gums, resins, and glass, and even ordinary minerals, so as to make light pass through them, and exhibit, to the eye which receives it, the structure they possess; but when the minerals are *precious* stones, either cut or uncut, and when we cannot shape them to transmit light, we must adopt a special process to obtain the same, or, in some cases, a much better result.

If a solid body has the same refractive power as a fluid, or the same power of bending the rays of light out of their path, it is obvious that if we place a fragment of the solid, such as a piece of broken flint-glass, through which we can see nothing, in a fluid of the same refractive power, such as oil of anise-seeds, the light will pass from the oil into the glass, and again out of the glass into the oil without suffering any change in its direction. The observer will therefore see through the glass distinctly, and through all its various thicknesses, and he will even be able to read through what is in reality a broken and rugged fragment.* By this process we see what could not be seen by any other process; for if a lapidary had cut parallel faces upon the glass, we could only have seen through it in certain directions and through certain thicknesses; whereas by the present method we can see through the fragment in every possible direction and through every degree of thickness.

The method now described will apply to an immense number of transparent minerals and other bodies; but it is applicable only very imperfectly to the diamond, zircon, garnet, sapphire, and ruby, and most imperfectly to the diamond, on account of there being no fluids whatever whose refractive power is as high as that of these five precious stones, as will appear from the following Table:—

Solid Bodies.	Refractive Power.	No fluids of nearly the same refractive power.
Diamond, . . .	2.439	
Zircon, . . .	1.961	
Garnet, . . .	1.815	
Fluid Bodies.		Refractive Power.
Sapphire, . . .	1.794	Muriate of antimony, . . . 1.800

* This experiment was first made by Sir David Brewster, and used for measuring the refractive power of fragments of minerals and other bodies.

Solid Bodies.	Refractive Power.	Fluid Bodies.	Refractive Power.
Ruby, . .	1.794		
Spinelle, .	1.764		
Chrysoberyl,	1.760		
Euclase, . .	1.643	Sulphuret of carbon, . . .	1.678
Topaz, . .	1.632	Oil of cassia,	1.641 ..
		Oil of cassia diluted with oil of olives may be employed for all inferior de- grees of refractive power.	
Emerald, .	1.585		
Aquamarine,	1.585		
Amethyst, .	1.564		
Cairngorm,	1.564		

It is obvious from this Table that *muriate*, or *butter*, of *antimony* may be used for sapphire, ruby, spinelle, and chrysoberyl, and it would even do for garnet. *Sulphuret of carbon* would answer for certain minerals, and *oil of cassia* would answer for euclase, and, when diluted with oil of olives, for all the gems from euclase to cairngorm, and for all minerals, &c. of inferior refractive power. We have, therefore, no method of looking through crystallized or cut diamonds with any degree of satisfaction; but it is obvious that some advantage may be gained by plunging them in *muriate of antimony*, or *sulphuret of carbon*, or even *oil of cassia*. Hence we are forced to study the structure of the diamond through flat plates or laskes, as they are called, or through certain table diamonds, when we can see through faces slightly inclined, or when we can cement a prism of glass upon any of their faces, to refract the rays in an opposite direction, and permit them to reach the eye, as nearly as possible, colourless.

It was by the application of all these processes that Sir David Brewster was enabled to exhibit the remarkable optical structure of the Diamond, which had not previously been the subject of investigation. In 1815 he examined *fourteen* specimens of diamond, and found that seven depolarized light, in virtue of an irregular structure which others did not possess. He subsequently, in the same year, examined *nine* diamonds, in all of which this irregular structure was exhibited. In one of these diamonds, of which he has given a drawing, there are various patches of a depolarizing structure, some of which are in a state of compression, and others of dilatation, as if a soft substance had been kneaded, as it were, and pressed in different directions; while in another specimen there were three luminous bands, two of which exhibited the action of a compressing, and the intermediate one of a dilating force. M. Biot, in commenting upon these experiments, gave it as his opinion that these effects were

the result of heat or of rapid evaporation;* but whatever was the cause, which this could not be, it is clear that the diamond has been in such a state as to yield to mechanical influences which have not operated upon other regularly crystallized bodies—that is, it has been *in a soft state*. The truth of this opinion was subsequently demonstrated by new experiments published in 1835. In a diamond laske with parallel surfaces he found two black specks of different sizes, which, under the microscope, proved to be cavities, round which, when examined by polarized light, there were four luminous wings or sectors separated by a black cross, and appeared a compressed structure. It was impossible to discover what these cavities contained, whether a fluid or a vapour, or a compressed gas; but they obviously contained something which had a mechanical energy capable of compressing the diamond, and it is equally obvious that the diamond was in a *soft state* when this force was exerted. These conclusions may startle ordinary readers; but when they know that cavities containing fluids, vapours, and compressed gas have been discovered in topaz and other precious stones, by Sir David Brewster, and the fluids, vapour, and gas actually taken out of them, their surprise will cease.

Such was the state of our information respecting the interior structure of the diamond when the Koh-i-noor arrived in England, and was shewn in the Great Exhibition. As this beautiful diamond had been cut, not to display its brilliant colours, but merely to preserve it of as great a weight as possible, it had no value as an ornamental gem. Her Majesty, therefore, was naturally desirous of having it re-cut, and wishing to have this done in the best manner, and with the least loss of weight, the opinion of different individuals was taken. In a Paper read at the Geological section of the British Association at Belfast,† Sir David Brewster stated, that having been consulted on this point by his Royal Highness Prince Albert, he expressed his anxiety to examine so large a mass of diamond before it was reduced in size, and rendered unfit for examination by the facets with which it would be covered. His request was graciously granted, and he accordingly examined it at Buckingham Palace with the microscope, and by the aid of polarized light. Its general structure was such as he had found in smaller diamonds, but of course much more beautifully displayed. The polarized tints produced by compression were as high as the *blue* of the *second* order of colours, though in many places not higher than the *white* and the *yellow* of the first order. Near the very centre of the dia-

* *Traité de Physique*, tom. iv. p. 573.

† See *Athenæum*, September 18th, 1852, p. 1014.

mond there were three black specks scarcely visible to the eye, but which the microscope shewed to be *cavities surrounded with sectors of polarized light*. These cavities were of a very irregular shape, and the sectors of light partook a little of that irregularity. In the two smaller diamonds there were also several cavities with sectors of polarized light, and the same polarizing structure which indicates the existence of compressing and dilating forces.

On one side of the Koh-i-noor there was an incision or flaw which was supposed to have been made to fix the setting upon the stone. Upon examining this cavity with the microscope, Sir David Brewster observed a yellow light on one part of it. This yellow light was supposed to come from part of the gold being rubbed off. As gold, however, is never yellow by transmitted light, and as gold rubbed off by friction could not possibly be transparent, Sir David had no doubt that the yellow matter was yellow diamond, and that it had originally existed in a fluid state in the cavity. Upon examining next day, along with Mr. Tennant, the collection of diamonds in the British Museum, he saw a remarkable specimen of colourless diamond on the cleavage surface of which there grew a semi-octohedron of *yellow diamond*. Upon a narrow examination he found in the edge of the specimen a cavity with the extremity of which this yellow diamond was connected, and finding in the other end of the cavity a portion of amorphous yellow diamond, he was led to the conclusion that the semi-octohedron of yellow diamond had existed in a fluid state in the cavity, and, having been driven from the cavity, had crystallized upon the cleavage surface. In the Paper referred to Sir David remarked that he was aware that such a conclusion made a great demand upon the faith of the mineralogist, but that those who had seen, as he had often seen, cavities of topaz filled with crystals of different properties, some of which were fused by heat and some not,—who had seen these melted crystals again crystallize and recover their former magnitude and shape,—who had seen the fluid contents of cavities boil, and throw up clouds of vapour,—and who had seen the fluid contents of a cavity when opened fall upon the surface of the specimen and change into a regular crystal,—that those who had seen such results would not be unwilling to believe that there might be fluids in the cavities of diamonds capable of exhibiting the same phenomena.

Desirous of gaining more information on this curious subject our author examined nearly fifty diamonds, which were kindly lent to him by Messrs. Hunt and Roskill, and in a vast number of these, or almost all, he found numbers of cavities of the most singular forms, round which the substance of the stone was com-

pressed and altered in the most remarkable manner. The shapes of the cavities sometimes resembled insects and lobsters, and the streaks and patches of colour in polarized light were of the most variegated kind. In examining the hundreds of diamonds which form some of the Oriental ornaments of the East India Company's Museum, our author found that all these stones contained large cavities, and were, in short, coarse and flawed diamonds which could not be cut into brilliants, or used in rings and other ornaments. It seems indeed to be a general truth that there are comparatively few diamonds without cavities and flaws, and that the diamond is a fouler stone than any other used in jewellery. Some diamonds, indeed, derive their *black* colour entirely from the number of cavities which they contain, and which will not permit any light to pass between them. What these cavities contain remains to be discovered. We have now before us a *crystallized* cavity in a specimen sent us by Mr. Sebastian Garrard, Jeweller to the Crown, but whatever it does contain is transparent. Berzelius informs us that there is a diamond in the collection of the Countess Porlier, in which, Mr. Parrot says, there is a black mass resembling coal, and which he thinks "is coal which did not become crystallized into the transparent gem;"* but the most remarkable cavity we have heard of is that described by Tavernier in a diamond of 104 carats, which was so foul in the middle that nobody would buy it. "A Hollander," he says, at length bought it, and, cutting it in two, found in the middle of it *eight carats of filth like a rotten weed!*"

The process of cutting diamonds is one of great interest, and as the facts observed during the cutting of the Koh-i-noor are both new and valuable, we have much pleasure in adding the following communication, for which we are indebted to Mr. Garrard, under whose skilful care and superintendence this important operation has been so well and so safely performed.

"The process of diamond cutting is effected by a horizontal iron plate, of about ten inches in diameter, called a *schyf*, which revolves from two to three thousand times per minute. The diamond is fixed in a ball of lead which is fitted to an arm, one end of which rests upon the table in which the plate revolves, and the other, at which the ball containing the diamond is fixed, is pressed upon the plate by moveable weights at the discretion of the workman. The weights applied vary, according to the size of the facets intended to be cut, from two to thirty pounds.

"The recutting of the *Koh-i-noor* Diamond was commenced July 16, 1852, by his Grace the late Duke of Wellington, and

* Berzelius's *Rapport Annuel*, 1839, p. 297.

the part first worked upon was that at which the planes P and F* meet, as it was necessary to reduce the stone at that part to level the set of the stone before the table could be formed, the intention being to turn* the stone rather on one side, and to take the incision or flaw at E, and the fracture at M, as the boundaries or sides of the girdle. The next important step taken, was endeavouring to remove an incision or flaw at C, described by Professor Tennant and the Rev. W. Mitchell, as having been made for the purpose of holding the stone more firmly in its setting, but this incision was pronounced by the cutters (after having cut into and examined it) to be a natural flaw of a yellow tinge, a defect often met with in small stones. This statement, if correct, will prove that that part must have been an original plane of the Octohedron. The next step was cutting a facet on the top of the stone, immediately above the last mentioned flaw: Here the difference in the hardness of the stone first manifested itself, for while cutting this facet the lapidary, noticing that the work did not proceed so fast as before, allowed the diamond to remain on the schyf rather longer than usual, without taking it off to cool; the consequence of this was, that the diamond became so hot from the continued friction and greater weight applied, that it melted the lead in which it was fixed: Again, while cutting the same facet the schyf became so hot from the extreme hardness of the stone, that particles of iron mixed with diamond powder and oil became ignited. The probable cause of the diamond proving so hard at this part is, that the lapidary was obliged to cut directly upon the point or angle at which the two cleavage planes meet, so that he was cutting across the grain of the stone. Another step that was thought to be important by the cutters, was removing a flaw at G. This flaw was not thought to be dangerous by Professor Tennant and the Rev. W. Mitchell, as if it was allowed to run according to the cleavage, it would only take off a small piece, which it was necessary to remove in order to get the present shape. The cutters, however, had an idea that it might not take the desired direction, and therefore began to cut into it from both sides, and afterwards directly upon it, getting rid of it in this manner. While cutting, the stone appeared to get harder and harder the further it was cut into, especially just above the flaw at A, which part became so hard, that after working upon it for six hours, it was found impossible to proceed with the work at the usual speed, the schyf was then revolving at 2400 times a minute. The speed was then increased to 3000 times a minute, when the work gra-

* We have left the letters in the text, though we cannot give the diagrams to which they refer.

dually proceeded. When the back of the stone (the former top) was cut, it proved to be so soft, that $\frac{1}{2}$ facet was cut in three hours, that would have occupied more than a day if the stone had been as hard at this part as at the top; the stone got gradually harder afterwards, especially underneath the flaw at A, which part was nearly as hard as that directly above it. An attempt was made to cut out the flaw at A, but it was found not desirable on account of its length. The flaw at N did not at all interfere with the cutting."

We had intended to give some account of the other precious stones of unusual magnitude and value, such as the *sapphires*, *rubies*, *emeralds*, and *topazes*, which have been preserved in the Royal Repositories of the eastern and western world; but our restricted limits will not permit us, and we shall therefore conclude this article with an explanation of the methods which may be successfully employed in distinguishing the diamond from the precious stones to which it has an outward resemblance, and the artificial pastes or glasses which are made to resemble it; and also the methods of distinguishing all the precious stones from their artificial imitations. These methods are very little known, and very little practised, and we think it discreditable, in an intellectual age like the present, that those who buy and sell and wear the rarest and finest jewels, should scarcely know the simplest rules for determining whether they are buying, selling, or wearing pieces of coloured glass.

When the diamond is rough and uncut it may be distinguished from rough and uncut sapphires, rubies, topazes, cairngorms, amethysts, and quartz, from its giving *vitreous* electricity by friction, while all the others give *resinous* electricity. The diamond, in its octohedral form, is distinguished from the octohedral spinelle, by the former easily scratching the latter. It is distinguished from the sapphire, whether colourless or coloured, by the latter having a specific gravity greater than the former; and it is distinguished from the colourless topaz by the latter giving signs of electricity for several hours after it has been rubbed, whereas the diamond loses its electricity in a quarter of an hour.

These methods are obviously suited only for the mineralogist and the jeweller, who have instruments for the purpose. When the stones are cut and set in gold, another method must be adopted. The *diamond* and the *garnet* are distinguished from all other precious stones, by their having only *single refraction*, the others having *double refraction*, or giving a *double* image of a taper, or small light, when it is viewed through their facets. By the same means all precious stones, except diamond, and garnet, and spinelle, are distinguished from artificial ones, by the former having double

refraction, and the latter only single refraction. Even when the precious stones are set opaque, that is, when we cannot see through them, it is easy to find whether the refraction is single or double, by looking into the stone at the image reflected from the posterior facets. If any of the precious or artificial stones are immersed in alcohol, or even water, they lose their lustre, while the diamond does not. This arises from their having an inferior refractive, and, consequently, reflecting power, so that the light reflected from their facets is very small compared with that which comes from the diamond. On a modification of this principle Sir David Brewster has constructed an instrument which he calls a *Lithoscope*,* for distinguishing precious stones from one another, and from their imitations. It consists of a small glass prism, which moves round a fixed joint, so that the lower surface of it may be laid upon the surface, or upon a facet, of the stone to be examined. In this position the two surfaces are parallel, and the image reflected from the lower surface of the prism would coincide with that reflected from the surface or facet of the stone. A drop of oil—oil of olives, oil of aniseed, oil of cassia, or sulphuret of carbon, may then, according to circumstances, be placed between the prism and the facet, and when this is done the observer turns a screw, so as to raise the prism a little round its joint. The effect of this is to separate the image of a taper, or a small luminous aperture, as given by the prism, from that given by the facet, and the difference in the intensity and the colour of these two images is an infallible indication of the nature of the stone. In the case of the diamond, with all oils, the image reflected from its facets will be many more times brighter than the image reflected from the face of the prism,† than with any other of the precious stones.

In perusing the preceding pages the reader cannot fail to have been struck with the singular nature of the substance to which his attention has been called. In all its characters and relations the diamond occupies a peculiar and a lofty place. It is the monarch of the subterranean world:—the material divinity which the Pagan, the Jew, and the Christian worship with equal idolatry. The *sacra fames auri*, the accursed thirst for gold, is an inferior and less exciting passion than that with which we would

* From *lithos*, a stone, and *scopia*, to see. This instrument as made by Dollond, was exhibited to the British Association at York in 1832. See *First Report*, &c., p. 78.

† A well-known though generally ill-practised method of distinguishing precious from artificial stones, is to touch them with the tongue. The stone being the best conductor of heat, will feel cold, and the glass much less so. The two should, previous to the experiment, be placed close to each other, till they have acquired the same temperature.

struggle for the gigantic brilliant, or scramble for its glittering fragments. Over this globe of ours there rules many a mighty sovereign—on its surface are many rich and powerful empires—many a cloud cap't tower and gorgeous palace rises above its plains—many a mass of gold and of silver has been wrenched from its bowels—and many a gem of art has arrested the intellectual eye;—but more loved than Sovereigns—more prized than empires—more coveted than gold—more admired than the creations of Raphael, is the sparkling diamond which flashes in the imperial crown or adorns the royal sceptre, or adds to beauty its only “foreign aid.” Nor is this an ideal appreciation of its rarity and worth. It is in truth the very essence of property. It is riches condensed and wealth secured—too small to be seen by the midnight burglar—too easily hid to be seized by the tyrant—and too quickly carried away to be wrested from the patriot exile, or torn from the hunted outlaw. In vain would the vanquished monarch strive to remove his bags of gold, or transport his territorial domains;—but a diamond is an empire made portable, with which he might purchase a better kingdom and mount a prouder throne. Had the treasury of Cræsus been invested in brilliants he might have founded a nobler Lydia beyond the reach of his Persian invader.

It is difficult to express in words or in numbers the commercial value of the Diamond; but we may truly say that a string of Koh-i-noors, a furlong in length, would purchase the fee-simple of the globe, while a ring engirdling the Arctic Zone would buy up the whole planetary system.

A moral as well as a secular lesson is read to us by the diamond. Like every organism of this world it bears the impress of decay. The stoutest metal and the toughest gem exist by forces which time weakens and the elements destroy; and in that great catastrophe when the “Earth and the works which are therein shall be burned up,” the jewel so highly prized will pass into its primeval cinder, while the silver and the gold will only change their form, and reappear perchance brighter and purer in the new earth which is to arise. Let us covet then the virgin gold and the pure silver of truth and justice, and estimate at their real value the glittering qualities and the dazzling possessions which bear so high a value in this world, but which have none in the next.

- ART. VII.—1. *Uncle Tom's Cabin, or Life among the Lowly.*
By HARRIET BEECHER STOWE. Boston, 1852.
2. *Aunt Phillis's Cabin, or Southern Life as it is.* By MRS.
EASTMAN.
3. *Slavery in the Southern States.* By a CAROLINIAN.*

THE ordinary office of a Review is to introduce a book to the notice of its readers. But no such task is ours in the present instance. The question asked with respect to "*Uncle Tom's Cabin*" is not "have you read it?" but, "what do you think of it?" It is already the book of two hemispheres. The number of its readers is one of the chief literary and social phenomena of the age. Within a few months it has been more than twenty times reprinted. It has spread in hundreds of thousands on both sides of the Atlantic, and has occupied the minds and tongues of men more than any other book of our time. Ordinary criticism has here for the present no place. We covet not the office of criticising a picture before which all that have eyes and hearts are still standing breathless as before the living reality. We deem it idle to tell of the author's powers of pathos to those whose eyes are yet moist with the tears it has called forth—to speak of mastery over human passions, to those whose hearts are still in turn shuddering with horror, glowing with indignation, and melting with pity. It is not for us to wield our critic-rod even but as a divining-rod, to point to where treasures lie; and gladly do we lay it down at the feet of the gifted authoress, whose highest praise it is that we lose the recollection of the genius that has produced this book, in the intense power of its truth, appealing to every human heart and conscience. We hail it as the noble work of a noble woman in a noble cause. And as a woman's work, we hail it, not merely admiringly, but hopefully, as a bright omen of the speedy triumph of this noble cause. We remember that it was a woman, Elizabeth Heyrick, who wrote the pamphlet that moved the heart of Wilberforce, to pity, and to pray over, the wrongs of the oppressed sons of Africa, and sent him forth to his life-long struggle on their behalf. We bid this true-hearted woman accept the omen of his success.

One mark of genius displayed in Mrs. Stowe's work it may be worth while to notice, because many of her readers are likely to have overlooked it, though feeling its effects. A work of fiction, read with more intense and more widely-spread interest than any this age has seen, is destitute of that which is the ordinary resource of writers of fiction—the adventures of *two lovers*.

* Published in *Fraser's Magazine*, October 1852.

The omission of this is what hardly any writer of fiction, bad or good, has ever ventured on, since Shakspeare, with the single exception of Defoe. Not even Sir Walter Scott, not even Miss Austen, could venture on this omission. But it is to be found in two of the most powerfully interesting works that ever were produced—ROBINSON CRUSOE and UNCLE TOM.

But, as we have said, our object is not to furnish a literary criticism of this extraordinary book. We turn to the hideous social malady which roused the genius of its author, to compare with these awful pictures which all the civilized world has been studying for months past in a work of fiction, some specimens selected at random from the mass of plain but authentic documents, now in our possession, illustrating the reception of her book in America, and more generally slave life, and the social position of the slaves in that country. Here we find ourselves so overloaded, that our chief trouble and grief is caused not by the difficulty of finding facts, but by the impossibility of finding a place in our pages for more than a few small fragments of the evidence which has been recently placed in our possession.

A preliminary word on the charge of partisanship which some have alleged against Mrs. Stowe. Amid all the horrors of her tale, and the anguish she keeps alive in every reader, she has taught us to feel deep sympathy with a class of slaveholders of whom, in her St. Clare and Mrs. Shelby, she has furnished us with types. Canning is reported to have said that "to depend upon the honour of another is to depend upon his will; and to depend upon the will of another is to be a slave." Now, while Mrs. Stowe has shown that circumstances uncontrollable by the slave-owner must render his *honour* no security at all to the slave, from any extremes of evil possible under the *system*, yet none can read her book without saying, "there is honour among slaveholders." She has fully recognised what we know to be a fact—the existence of many slave-owners in the South States who care for and take pains to promote the welfare of their slaves—who would choose to be the victims rather than the inflictors of the cruelties she has laid bare. We know that there are many to whose high moral natures the system of slavery is an overwhelming burden—who having received it as a heritage from their fathers, feel it to be a heritage of woe, and are ready to say "the fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge." Mrs. Stowe has taught us generous sympathy for these men, while she has revealed to us the uncontrollable necessities of a *system* which is an incubus on the moral energies of the western world, and deliverance from which is become a matter of life and death. Her book leaves the conviction that the evil lies in the *essence* of the system and not in its *accidents*.

She illustrates the manner in which the most frightful sufferings naturally issue out of the most favourable circumstances in which slavery can exist. The dramatic power of the work is not more remarkable than the moderation, large views, and excellent sense of the writer.

Amid all the tributes to this appeal of Mrs. Stowe to every human feeling and every christian principle, there is, perhaps, no greater tribute to its power than the kind and multitude of *answers* that have issued, and are still issuing, from the upholders and abettors of the slave-system, of whose horrors this tremendous revelation has been made. We have said that the power of the book lies in its truth, directed to the consciences of men—and, accordingly, we find that the consciences of men are dealing with it *as* truth. And perhaps it is in its being an appeal to conscience, and in its being responded to as such, that the book stands out from the class to which it nominally belongs. When did an army of journalists, and novelists, and pamphleteers—in fact, all the legal organs of society, ever before so set themselves in battle-array to contend against the truth of a so-called "work of fiction?" When, before, were so many pens employed to refute the "wild and unreal pictures"—the "monstrous exaggerations"—the "abominable libels"—to repel the "calumny and insult" of a novel? But the fact is, that Mrs. Stowe has told the truth fearlessly; and therefore is she not only answered, but answered wrathfully; and should these answers not teach us to doubt her statements, they will, at least, teach us to estimate the degree of moral courage, the power of christian principle, required to enable her to speak the truth in America.

We shall first give our readers a specimen of the many answers to Mrs. Stowe, which we think may assist them to decide whether her assailants give more honourable testimony to the character of Southern slaveholders than she herself does. We give the following article at full length :—

(*From the Weekly Picayune, New Orleans, August 30, 1852.*)

"UNCLE TOM."

"It is stated in Eastern papers that an experienced writer in Boston is engaged in dramatizing the abolition novel, 'Uncle Tom's Cabin,' and that it is about to be produced upon the stage in that city. The gross misrepresentations of the south, which have been propagated so extensively through the press, with the laudations of editors, politicians, and pious fanatics of the pulpit, are to be presented in tableaux, and the lies they contain acted by living libellers, before crowds of deluded spectators. The stage is to be employed in depicting to the people of the north the whole body of the people of the south, as living in a state of profligacy, cruelty, and crime—tyrants, who fear not God, and cruelly oppress their fellow-creatures ;

and the drama is thus enlisted among the promoters of sectional hatred, a teacher and preacher of national discord, whose end inevitably would be the disruption of the Union. How long is it supposed that political harmony can subsist, after the alienation of feeling shall have been fully established which this organized system of misrepresentation and insult, on one side, and the natural instincts of resentment and retaliation on the other, must create? What better materials can be found for mutual hatred and perpetual warfare? How long would men consent to live together on such terms; and from a severed Union, what else can follow but open and unappeasable hostilities, more real and more insatiate than those which, for hundreds of years, made France and England, divided only by a narrow firth, look on each other as natural enemies; and every individual Englishman think of a Frenchman as something he was bound to hate and destroy? The tendency of all the anti-slavery demonstrations in the north—abolition novels, abolition lectures, pictorial abolitionism, and now the abuse of the stage to the purposes of calumny and insult, in aid of abolitionism—is to create a more intense international enmity, than could ever rage between nations of different languages and institutions. There are no feuds so deadly as those of disunited families; no enemies so remorseless as brothers who have once torn asunder all the ties and charities of kindred blood.

"It is with a shuddering thought of these consequences, which the folly and cupidity of the times will not see, that we read of the popularity, at the north, of such books as '*Uncle Tom's Cabin*;' and the attempts to give it a more effective form, by presenting it on the stage, fixing it with all the arts of scenery, on the memory of thousands who do not read, as a true picture of life and morals at the south; bringing up a new generation with the ineradicable idea that there is in one-half the territory of the United States, a people to whom the monstrous inhumanities and shameless corruptions described with so much deplorable art by this authoress, are familiar and welcome as their daily food. The success of the attempt must be a dreadful calamity, the source of innumerable horrors to both sections and both races; and even if it should not prove to be successful, the attempt itself is a great crime, meriting universal abhorrence. It is deplorable that a woman should be the chief instrument in this labour of mischief. We know nothing of Mrs. Harriet Beecher Stowe, except from her book; but there is enough in that to give her an odious notoriety. She has too much mind not to comprehend the wicked injustice and dangerous consequences of the distorted picture she has drawn of slave-life and southern morals. She knows that a picture of northern society, in which the Polly Bodines, the Ann Hoags, and John W. Websters, were portrayed as true representatives of the principles and habits of New York or Massachusetts, would be as correct in material facts, as her story of planting life in the south; and she would no doubt feel an inexpressible disgust for the yellow bound literature which should circulate such abominations.

"But her own task has been not a particle more honourable, nay, her work ought to be ranked below those in its moral purpose, and herself rebuked with sterner severity; because she has degraded to her unseemly and mischievous labours powers which might have been usefully and gracefully devoted to delicate and womanly compositions. The secret of this voluntary debasement is, we fear, to be found in a calculation of profit most cordially masculine, in the misusing of her thoughts for the sake of gain. The dollars with which she has been enabled to make herself rich, to buy that snug country place, and seat herself down for a life of luxurious leisure, had more attractions for her than the love of truth, or the natural feminine instincts for peace. Hence she dipped her pen in the bitterest gall of malevolence, and has written one of the most abominable libels which the age has produced, full of all manner of calumnies and uncharitableness; and provocative of mischief beyond her power to check, if she would. Such a desecration of woman's nature is a sorry and a rare sight, even in this age of feminine aspirations to rivalry with man in all his harshest of traits, and all his most unamiable pursuits."

Now assuredly the writer of such a paragraph as the above leaves little doubt that he is very angry. He does not pretend to any philosophic indifference to unjust accusation, still less to the calm dignity of christian patience under calumny. He does not say, "Let the galled jade wince, my withers are unwrung." No, he honestly says, "We have galls, and though we have some grace, yet have we some revenge." He is angry, and he lets us see it. Not only to Mrs. Stowe herself does he attribute heartless cruelty, shameless falsehood, and gross cupidity, but also to all those aiding her efforts, or even giving credit to her statements; and, according to him, the number is very great. In justice to him, we are bound to mention that a similar testimony is borne to the character of a large proportion of the "Northerners" by the author of "Aunt Phillis's Cabin," another of the answers to "Uncle Tom." Now, supposing this to be true, or half true, it follows that in about half of the United States, there are very many persons mercenary, unjust, reckless, passionate, cruel, and merciless; and we are naturally led to inquire which of these qualities render the persons in whom they are displayed, fit to have *uncontrolled power* over their fellow-men? And if it be established that in the *Northern States* there is a considerable proportion of persons unfit to be entrusted with *uncontrolled power*, what warrant have we that it is not the same in the *South*? what reason have we to believe that the "Southerners" are universally mild, humane, conscientious, and considerate? We cannot find a reason in the difference of race, for they are, on the whole, the same race; nor can we suppose a few degrees of latitude can make so great a difference of

character. Where then can we find any reason to trust the "Southerners" while distrusting the "Northerners," unless, indeed, we are to believe that the *non-existence of slavery* can corrupt the morals of a people, or its *existence* confer and promote moral elevation?

On the whole, we think we have reason to congratulate Mrs. Stowe on having at least a candid opponent in the editor of the New Orleans paper. Not only by not attempting to deny does he admit the *possibility* of the occurrence of these "outrageous inhumanities," and "shameless corruptions described with so much deplorable art," but he furnishes us in the very same paper with an instance of their actual occurrence. We copy the paragraph:—

"*Outrageous Cruelty—Quick Retribution.*—The *Memphis Eagle* states that, some time since, one Matthew Rayner, who resides in the vicinity of Raleigh, Tenn., had one of his negro men to run away. He apprehended him in Memphis, and took him home. The next day he commenced a cruel and fiend-like punishment, and, after inflicting upon him hundreds of lashes, concluded by cutting off both of the negro's ears close to his head. The shocking facts spread through the neighbourhood, and news was *some way* conveyed to Rayner that a warrant had been issued for his apprehension. Upon hearing this he immediately left the county, and arrived at the residence of a Mr. Beard, in Tipton county, where he died the next day, and was buried at his residence on the 10th instant."

There, certainly, is here strong expression of very natural horror; and yet we cannot but suspect that it is the *cropping off the man's ears* that has excited it, from his expectation that legal punishment was to follow the deed. For it is certain that this would not have been entailed by any amount of mere *flogging*. Indeed, how could it? Unless every slave against whom his master had any complaint, were brought before a magistrate, who should allot the due amount, and also see it inflicted? But this would involve the master's passing his whole life before the tribunal: and therefore, with all due regard for his valuable time, and to the claims of justice for immediate satisfaction, by the laws of South Carolina and Louisiana, a discretionary power is given to the master himself to punish his slaves "by whipping or beating with a horse-whip, cow-skin switch, or stick, or by ironing or impressing."*

But though the paragraph states that the legal authorities did take cognizance of this crime so far as to issue a warrant for the arrest of its perpetrator, with a view, it is to be presumed, to

* Laws of Carolina. Brevard's Digest. Slaves, 543. And Digest of Louisiana. Code Noir, sect. Crimes and Punishments. Sect. 16, vol. i.

bring him to trial; yet we cannot be sure what the result might have been, or whether punishment would have been inflicted. And our doubt will not appear irrational when it is remembered that this occurrence took place in Memphis, a town in the State of Tennessee, whose slave-code actually contains a provision that makes the penalty of false witness to be "*a cropping*" of both ears, with an exposure of the negro in the pillory for two hours, each ear being successively nailed to it for one hour, and then cut off*.

But we have other testimony besides that furnished by the indignation or the alarm of this New Orleans exponent of the minds of the Southern slaveholders, to the truthfulness of Mrs. Stowe's representations of the realities of slave-life; we have ourselves obtained the strong testimony of a distinguished author, a Barbadian by birth, and who has himself owned slaves. He says, (in a letter to a friend,) "The picture of American slavery in *Uncle Tom* is not the less faithful because a stranger visiting the country sees so little of it; and because the *general* conduct of slave-owners may be humane. The worst cases no one sees. Slavery was mitigated in our West Indian Colonies by the small size of the islands, and the check of public opinion which reaches every corner. But in the remote districts of America, and even of Jamaica, what may and must have taken place when every master was a law to himself?"

And this last fact enables us to reconcile the contradictory reports which present the condition of the slave in such totally different aspects. "Every master is a law to himself," and according as he is humane and generous, or selfish and cruel, controlled or uncontrolled, by the external circumstances in which he is placed, so does he deal with his slaves. A friend of ours told us that he was once staying in a house where a lady who was visiting rebuked him for saying something against slavery, asking whether he had ever been in the West Indies. He said "No, but that he was intimate with many West Indians." She replied, that he could not be any judge. She had spent six weeks in Jamaica with her friend Mr. Smith, or Mr. Jones, and she could testify that the slaves were well treated, and very happy, and far better off than the poor of this country. The lady of the house, who had much sly humour, observed to her, "Your friend Mr. Smith was a *remarkably* kind-hearted, good-man, was he not?" "Oh, yes, most *singularly* so." Her auditors exchanged glances, but left her contented with her supposed proof.

Such was the good lady's report, and we doubt not there are

* Statute Law of Tennessee, vol. i. Slaves, p. 313.

many similar instances. But we are obliged to present another and not quite so pleasing picture of the negro's *happiness*, under the beneficent rule of the absolute owner of the negro, "body and soul." This picture of human life under a slave system is drawn from informations sworn before the House of Commons, on occasion of the inquiry into the state of the West Indian Colonies. We would gladly spare our readers and ourselves the disgusting details of facts which, taken from legal documents, exhibit as cruel an infliction of *physical suffering* as do those statements of Mrs. Stowe, which her milder assailants characterize as "gross exaggerations," as "a most wild and unreal picture of slavery," as "imaginative sketches," as "well-seasoned horrors." It is matter of fact, that in the island of Tortola, on one plantation, during a period of three years, *sixty* negroes died from severity of punishment, and for that whole time but *one* negro died a natural death. Children of nine years old were taken up by the heels and dipped into tubs of water with their heads downward, kept there till stifled, then taken out and suffered to recover breath, when they were again treated in the same manner, and afterwards suspended from a tree with the hands tied together, and cart-whipped. In one case a child, about ten years of age, died with its skin almost entirely off. It had been dipped, by its master's order, into a caldron of boiling liquor. Three women suspected of an attempt to poison their mistress, had a quantity of boiling water poured down their throats, and after being severely cart-whipped, were sent chained together and in a state of entire nakedness to work in the fields. But we pause. There are other parts of this *Aceldama* upon which we dare not enter. Could it be credible by any one unacquainted with the baleful influence of this system upon all who breathe its atmosphere, that this wretch was regarded by the people around him as a "gentleman that had a 'comical way' with his negroes, but was in the main a good man."

The late Sir Charles Wale, when governor of an island taken from the French, set himself to devise plans (which were put a stop to by the cession of the island to France) for mitigating the horrors of slavery. One of the instances which came under his notice (we speak on the best authority, and are prepared to verify the facts by indubitable proofs) was that of a negro who had been suspended by the arms for several weeks, until he had so completely lost the use of them, that he was ever after obliged, unless some one fed him like an infant, to take his food like a dog by putting down his mouth to it.

But it may be said further, that the particular cases we have mentioned happened many years ago, and in an obscure island of

the West Indies. We will call another witness to bear his testimony to the state of things at this day in New Orleans. That witness is Dr. Howe, the friend and instructor of Laura Bridgeman.* In a letter from him to Mr. Charles Sumner, which we have read, he thus bears the testimony of an eye-witness against slavery:—

“ I have passed ten days in New Orleans, not unprofitably, I trust, in examining the public institutions—the schools, asylums, hospitals, prisons, &c. With the exception of the first there is little hope of amelioration. I know not how much merit there may be in their system, but I do know that, in the administration of the penal code, there are abominations which should bring down the fate of Sodom upon the city.

“ If Howard or Mrs. Fry ever discovered so ill administered a den of thieves as the New Orleans prison, they never described it. In the negro's apartment I saw much which made me blush that I was a white man, and which for a moment stirred up an evil spirit in my animal nature. Entering a large paved court-yard, around which ran galleries filled with slaves of all ages, sexes, and colours, I heard the snap of a whip, every stroke of which sounded like the sharp crack of a pistol. I turned my head, and beheld a sight which absolutely chilled me to the marrow of my bones, and gave me, for the first time in my life, the sensation of my hair stiffening at the roots. There lay a black girl flat upon her face on a board, her two thumbs tied, and fastened to one end, her feet tied and drawn tightly to the other end, while a strap passed over the small of her back, and fastened around the board, compressed her closely to it. Below the strap she was entirely naked. By her side, and six feet off, stood a huge negro, with a long whip, which he applied with dreadful power and wonderful precision. Every stroke brought away a strip of skin, which clung to the lash, or fell quivering on the pavement, while the blood followed after it. The poor creature writhed and shrieked, and in a voice which showed alike her fear of death and her dreadful agony, screamed to her master, who stood at her head, ‘ Oh, spare my life ; don't cut my soul out ! ’ But still fell the horrid lash ; still strip after strip peeled off from the skin ; gash after gash was cut in her living flesh, until it became a livid and bloody mass of raw and quivering muscle.

“ It was with the greatest difficulty I refrained from springing upon the torturer, and arresting his lash ; but alas, what could I do, but turn aside to hide my tears for the sufferer, and my blushes for humanity !

“ This was in a public and regularly organized prison ; the punishment was one recognised and authorized by the law. But think you the poor wretch had committed a heinous offence, and had been convicted thereof, and sentenced to the lash ? Not at all ! She was brought

* Mentioned in Archbishop Whately's *Elements of Logic*, (note, pp. 19, 20, 9th edition.)

by her master to be whipped by the common executioner, without trial, judge, or jury, just at his beck of nod, for some real or supposed offence, or to gratify his own whim or malice. And he may bring her day after day, without cause assigned, and inflict any number of lashes he pleases, short of twenty-five, provided only he pays the fee. Or if he choose, he may have a private whipping-board on his own premises, and brutalize himself there.

"A shocking part of this horrid punishment was its publicity, as I have said; it was in a court-yard, surrounded by galleries, which were filled with coloured persons of all sexes—run-away slaves committed for some crime, or slaves up for sale. You would naturally suppose they crowded forward and gazed horror-stricken at the brutal spectacle below; but they did not; many of them hardly noticed it, and many were entirely indifferent to it. They went on in their childish pursuits, and some were laughing outright in the distant parts of the galleries;—so low can man created in God's image be sunk in brutality."

And now, has Mrs. Stowe exaggerated? Do the colours of her "most wild and unreal picture"—"the phantoms of a prurient imagination" fade before the light of sober reality? The heart shudders and the nerves quiver as we read her tale of torture and of death; but, in the actual working of the system itself, there are deeper horrors which she has *not* unrolled, on that scroll like unto the Prophet's, "written within and without, lamentations, and mourning, and woe." Hear her own words. We have ourselves been favoured with the sight of a letter from her, and we give the heart-words of this true-hearted woman. She is speaking of her book:—"There has been hardly a day since it has been published that confirmatory voices have not come from southern slaveholders; men who have long waited for an opportunity to speak, and who now come out to attest its truth—for, alas! they know what I know, and they must perceive that I know it, that the half is not told in that book. A book that should tell all would not be credited—it *could not be read*. . . . I have only wondered some moments, in the anguish of the survey, that the firm earth does not collapse to hide such horror from the sun!"

But now assuming that no single instance could be proved of wrong suffered from this entire dependence of many men upon the arbitrary will of one man—and this absolute dependence is the essence of slavery—this surely could be no ground for the defence of a system under which there could be a *possibility*, not merely of its occurring, but of its occurring without violating one essential principle of that system. "Nephew," said Algernon Sydney in prison on the night before his execution, "I value not my own life a chip; but what concerns me is that

the law which takes away my life, may hang every one of you whenever it is thought convenient."

But even supposing the *system* were such as to be quite unexceptionable, when well administered; and that nothing but its *abuses* were ever deserving of censure,—are the citizens of the United States prepared to pass a verdict of acquittal in *all* cases, and on every kind of system, on such grounds? Are they prepared, for instance, to substitute for their boasted republican institutions an absolute monarchy? Yet it is plain that a perfectly wise and good monarch would devote himself to the welfare of his people, and would most effectually promote it. And if so *many hundred thousands* of their slave-owners are thus qualified, (which they must be, to insure the good treatment of the slaves,) it would not be difficult for them to select *one* who should be thus qualified, and make him their autocrat. As for the atrocious cruelties of a Nero or a Domitian, they do not belong to the "institution itself;" they are only the *abuses* of it.

True it is that we ought to distinguish between the legitimate purpose—the intrinsic character—of any system, and its abuses. But to put out of account altogether the greater or less liability to abuses, and the greater or less enormity of them, and quietly to ignore every *incidental* evil, would be, in the ordinary concerns of life, regarded as proof of insanity. Who, for instance, would leave children at play in a room full of loaded fire-arms, and edge-tools, and open casks of gunpowder? Yet the tools were not *designed* to cut them, or the guns to shoot them. If they maim, kill, or blow up one another, these are only *abuses*. But what American, North or South, would like to be himself exposed to the risk of such abuses as, by their own shewing, slavery is liable to?

A writer in a late number of "The Times," finds security and protection for the slaves against the neglect, the recklessness, the violence, and the cruelty of their owners, in the principle of self-interest—because ill-treatment of them would impair their value. But does self-interest, we ask, avail to secure from man's neglect, or his violence, or his cruelty, the *brute* animals that are his property? Surely, we need only point to the daily police-reports, to find abundant evidence that, in the case of brute property, legal interposition is necessary to protect the horse, the donkey, the cattle, from him who on the ground of self-interest is the most concerned in their wellbeing. Why, then, should self-interest suffice to guard the negro from the passions and cruelty of an owner, in whose eye he ranks not higher than his cattle? And what is the rage of a passionate man against a *brute*, compared with what is felt against a fellow *man*?

The following advertisement, copied verbatim by Sir Charles

Lyell from a Natchez paper, illustrates the spirit and manner in which human "chattels" are disposed of in America in the intercourse of commerce :—

"NINETY NEGROES FOR SALE.

"I have about ninety negroes just arrived from Richmond, Virginia, of field hands, horse-servants, carriage-drivers, two sempstresses, several very fine cooks, (females,) and one very fine cook, (male.) One black-smith, one carpenter, and some excellent mules, and excellent waggons and harness, and one very fine riding horse—all of which I will sell at the most reasonable prices. I have made arrangements in Richmond, Va., to have regular shipments every month, and intend to keep a good stock on hand of every description of servants during the season.

"Natchez, October 16th.

JOHN D. JAMES."

And in a St. Louis paper, the following passage occurs in the account of a steamboat collision :—

"We learn that the passengers lost all their *effects*; one gentleman in particular lost nine negroes and fourteen horses."

The law of South Carolina expressly declares—"Slaves shall be deemed, taken, reputed, and adjudged, to be *chattels personal* in the hands of their masters and possessors to all intents and purposes whatever." There is, moreover, a plain admission on the part of the Slave States Legislature, that there is nothing that can be inflicted on a man, in this life, worse than slavery, in the fact that the punishment affixed to crimes committed by the slaves, is always *death*. Cases of arson, theft, and burglary, which would be comparatively lightly dealt with, if committed by white men, are all death, to the slave. But the legislature could not do otherwise, and this necessity is strongly stated in the following extract from "The Cincinnati Herald :"—

"A negro has committed a crime, is convicted and brought for sentence, and the question arises, what shall that sentence be? Shall he be fined? No, for we have already robbed him of all his property,—not a penny left which he can call his own. A fine, therefore, is out of the question. Shall we deprive him of liberty? We have done that already. We have completely stripped him of every right; we have sacrificed them to our avarice. We cannot take away that which he has not; and imprisonment to him would be a sweet pastime, a relief from the burning sun of the field, a source of real enjoyment. We cannot *punish* him by imprisonment; the dungeon would be a solace, a reward. We might separate him from his wife and children, and cause him to suffer thus as a punishment. No wife and children he has; they were sold away from him long ago. His children are torn from each other, and the mother from children and husband both. We cannot make him feel again on that point. The

wound was made, but the agony is over now, and the medicine was a despair, which palsied the heart beyond all power of feeling again. Shall we load him with chains? No, the marks on his wrists and ankles show yet, now raw and bloody, where the fetters were, when he was manacled *without* a crime, when he was chained in the gang, to be *driven* as a brute. There is no *punishment* in chains for him. Can we not scourge him? No, look at his back, fresh torn as it is with the lash. Scourging and torture are a familiar part of daily life with him. Everything but life has already, and often, been drained by the overseer's scourge; and scourging, therefore, would scarcely rise in his judgment to the dignity of a judicial infliction, and would produce very little *moral* effect.

"We might thrust him out of the pale of humanity, and pursue him and hunt him down as we would a beast of prey. That has been done already, more than once, and such incidents are familiar to him, and would present none of the terrors of novelty. That long scar on his cheek was where the bloodhound tore him; and that red line along his head was ploughed by a rifle-shot from his pursuing master. He has been *hunted* already. What then can be done with one whose common life, whose daily experience, is so horrible, that legal ingenuity and power, panting for revenge, can devise nothing worse than what is already upon him! One thing only remains, as the editor of the *Herakl* has said,—*He can be killed.* Everything but death he suffers now. *Let him be killed!*"

Such, then, is the light in which the slave is regarded by the slaveholder, by the laws of the country, and by a large proportion of its inhabitants. But still worse than this is the light in which the poor negro considers himself. And surely the worst feature of slavery after all, is that *conscious degradation of the man*, which is inseparable from his contented acquiescence in being a "chattel." Nor has Mrs. Stowe, in her admirable delineation of the negro character, omitted some happy touches in reference to this point. Eva is pleading with Topsy:

" 'What does make you so bad, Topsy? Why won't you try and be good? Don't you love *anybody*, Topsy?'

" 'Donno know nothing 'bout love; I loves candy and sich, that's all,' said Topsy.

" 'But you love your father and mother?'

" 'Never had none, ye know. I telled ye that, Miss Eva.'

" 'Oh, I know,' said Eva sadly; 'but hadn't you any brother, or sister, or aunt, or——'

" 'No, none on 'em—never had nothing nor nobody.'

" 'But Topsy, if you'd only try to be good, you might——'

" 'Couldn't never be nothin' but a nigger, if I was ever so good,' said Topsy. 'If I could be skinned, and come white, I'd try then.'

" 'But people can love you if you are black, Topsy. Miss Ophelia would love you if you were good.'

"Topsy gave the short blunt laugh that was her common mode of expressing incredulity.

" 'Do not you think so?' said Eva.

" 'No, she can't bar me, 'cause I'm a nigger! She'd's soon have a toad touch her. There can't nobody love niggers, and niggers can't do nothin'. I don't care,' said Topsy, beginning to whistle.

" 'O Topsy, poor child, I love you!' said Eva, with a sudden burst of feeling—and laying her little thin, white hand on Topsy's shoulder—'I love you, because you haven't had any father, or mother, or friends; because you've been a poor abused child! I love you, and I want you to be good. I am very unwell, Topsy, and I think I shan't live a great while; and it really grieves me, to have you be so naughty. I wish you would try to be good for my sake;—it's only a little while I shall be with you.'

"The round keen eyes of the black child were overcast with tears; large bright drops rolled heavily down, one by one, and fell on the little white hand. Yes, in that moment a ray of real belief, a ray of heavenly love, had penetrated the darkness of her heathen soul! She laid her head down between her knees, and wept and sobbed; while the beautiful child, bending over her, looked like the picture of some bright angel stooping to reclaim a sinner.

" 'Poor Topsy!' said Eva. 'Don't you know that Jesus loves all alike? He is just as willing to love you as me. He loves you just as I do,—only more, because he is better. He will help you to be good, and you can go to heaven at last, and be an angel for ever, just as much as if you were white. Only think of it, Topsy! You can be one of those spirits bright Uncle Tom sings about.'

" 'Oh dear Miss Eva, dear Miss Eva!' said the child, 'I will try, I will try! I never did care nothin' about it before.'

"St. Clare at this instant dropped the curtain. 'It puts me in mind of mother,' he said to Miss Ophelia. 'It is true what she told me; if we want to give sight to the blind, we must be willing to do as Christ did—call them to us, and put our hands on them.'"

A similar consciousness of inferiority is apparent in some of Aunt Chloe's little speeches. It was not in keeping with Mrs. Stowe's object to make it more prominent.

But still we are told on every side that the slaves are the happiest people in the world. The New Orleans paper says so, and Mrs. Eastman says so, and, indeed, almost every Anti-Abolitionist says so.* Slaves, we are told, *like* slavery. And if this

* The application of the word "happy" to slaves, suggests a circumstance related by Clarkson, the Negro's Friend. It occurred during the course of the Parliamentary Inquiry, previous to the passing of Sir William Dolben's bill, brought in with a view to lessen the horrors of the middle passage, by limiting the number of the slave cargo in proportion to the tonnage of the vessel. The evidence offered by the opponents of the measure was wound up by the statement that this voyage was one of the *happiest periods* of the negroes' lives, and it was given as a proof that, when upon deck, they were in the habit of amusing

be meant to apply only to individual instances, we are ready to admit it to be true. But if it be meant to assert that such is the case universally, or even generally, we feel bound, before we can give our assent to the proposition, to make a few inquiries. What is the meaning of the countless advertisements, offering rewards for the apprehension of runaway slaves, to be recognised by marks sufficient to prove the "happy" state they left, and which they were too dull or too ungrateful to appreciate? What is the meaning of certain legal provisions and enactments in the slave code of the States? Surely those legislators could not have been so fully impressed with this contentment with, not to say, preference for slavery, when they penned such enactments as that of Mississippi, which declares that "any person finding a fugitive negro, may seize, apprehend, and whip him on the spot—that any negro travelling without a pass is liable to be seized and put into jail—that the jailer shall interrogate the prisoners, and write by mail to the person by them described as master; if the account be false, he shall give each prisoner twenty-five lashes—well laid on," and "interrogate them anew," &c.; and for the space of six months it shall be his duty "alternately to interrogate and whip as aforesaid." What is the meaning of that law of South Carolina,* declaring death to be the punishment not only of the runaway slave, but of any person who shall choose to aid him in his escape? Or of that of Louisiana,† declaring it lawful to "fire upon any slaves who do not stop when pursued? Or of that of Tennessee, declaring it lawful for any person whatsoever, and by such ways or means as he or she (and it is such as these that charge Mrs. Stowe with being unfeminine) shall think fit to put to death any fugitive slave?"‡

Why is it that there is not anything like an admission of this love of slavery in the negro throughout the whole legislative code of the system, unless he find it in the enactment which, in the laws of Louisiana and Tennessee, provides for the gratification of this very natural desire for restoration to his cherished bondage, by ordering that if unreclaimed by the master, from whom he has escaped, he should be sold, or in that other of those morally elevating edicts, which decrees rewards to any citizen who shall apprehend the runaway? What is the meaning of the provision of the Constitution of Mississippi?—"The legislature shall have no power to pass laws for the emancipation of slaves,

themselves by dancing. But, when the witnesses came to be cross-examined, what description did they give of the dancing? The negroes, who usually lay chained two and two by the hands and feet, and heavily ironed, were made, after meals, to *jump for exercise*, deemed so necessary to their health that they were whipped if they refused to do it, and this jumping was what the witnesses called "*dancing*."

* Brevard's Digest, vol. ii. p. 286.

† Brevard's Digest of the Laws of Louisiana, Code Noir, vol. i. § 33.

‡ Laws of Tennessee, 1831, vol. i. p. 321.

without the consent of their owners, *unless when the slaves shall have rendered the State some distinguished service.** Who can reconcile freedom being there offered as a fit reward for distinguished service rendered to the State, with the continual assertions that the slaves would not accept freedom if offered to them? We think we shall scarcely be accused of pressing our argument too far, when we assert that we have been furnished with abundant proof, not only that the love of slavery is neither inherent in the negro, nor universally acquired by him, but that it is not considered to be so by the *legislators* for this "Domestic Institution."

This pretence, that slaves love slavery, that they are but coquetting with it, and want only to have a little gentle violence used, is like the Irish vindication in each case of the common crime of abduction,—“The girl wished in her heart to be carried off, and only wanted an excuse to give her father and mother.” Thus, too, the French, when invading Rome, urged that the Romans in their hearts wished for the overthrow of the Republic, but were overawed by bandits, and were glad of the coercion. If true, these statements only prove the consummated moral ruin of the victims of the system.

But perhaps we might be better able to form some conception of this “happiness,” if we could clearly understand the meaning of an expression which seems a favourite one with the Carolinian, whose letter, in vindication of the slaveholders and Southern slavery, has just appeared in *Fraser's Magazine*. It professes to be an answer on the part of the southern slaveholders to the question, “What do you think of Uncle Tom's Cabin?” In this pamphlet the writer speaks more than once of the “*vis medicatrix* of nature correcting the insufficiencies of legislation.” Truly such “insufficiencies” must be intended as Montesquieu thus describes,—“La loi de l'esclavage n'a jamais pu être utile à l'esclave; elle est dans tous les cas *contre* lui sans jamais être *pour* lui: ce qui est contraire au principe fondamental de toutes les sociétés.”

According to Montesquieu, there is not merely inadequate provision but adverse power. But to correct these “insufficiencies of law,” the “*vis medicatrix* of nature” comes in, according to the Carolinian. He had better have said that the law of the slave system comes in to correct nature—that is after the fashion of a slaveholder's correction—to trample upon it and to crush it. And he might have added that it was necessary to the very existence of slavery that law *should* come in to defend and maintain it. To use the eloquent language of Mr. Charles Sumner, in his speech on the 26th of August, in the American Senate, on the

* Laws of Mississippi, Section ii.

Fugitive Slave Bill :—"A power so peculiar and offensive, so hostile to reason, so repugnant to the law of nature and the inborn rights of man, which despoils its victims of the fruits of their labour; which substitutes concubinage for marriage; which abrogates the relation of parent and child; which, by a denial of education, abuses the intellect, prevents a true knowledge of God, and murders the very soul; which, amidst a plausible physical comfort, degrades man, created in the divine image, to the level of a beast;—such a power, so eminent, so transcendent, so tyrannical, so unjust, can find no place in any system of government, unless by virtue of *positive sanction*. It can spring from no doubtful phrases. It must be declared by unambiguous words, incapable of a double sense." So self-evident is this, that even the slaveholding tribunals have seen it. Mr. Sumner quotes the Supreme Court of Kentucky as declaring,—“We view this as a right existing by *positive law* of a municipal character, without foundation in the law of nature or the common law.”

The main argument of the Carolinian may be thus shortly stated,—“Whatever is not evil *in itself* ought to be judged favourably and acquitted without any reference to its *abuses*. Slavery is not evil in itself; therefore it must be judged irrespective of its abuses.” We deny both premises, and for reasons already given. We deny the first premiss, because, though it is true that we ought to *distinguish* between evils that are intrinsic, and incidental evils arising from accidental abuse; and also true that we ought not to condemn *at once* whatever may be abused—for food may cause death to the intemperate; yet to put *out of account altogether* the danger of abuses to which anything is liable, is an absurdity which no one would be guilty of in ordinary life. The tyranny of Nero was only the abuse of power which an absolute sovereign *might* have exercised for the benefit of his subjects.

We also deny the second premiss, that slavery is not evil in itself. Slavery is an evil even when not abused, and when the master is kind and judicious. Even if we could find security for a despot, that he should exercise his despotic power benevolently, yet his sway must degrade and paralyze the character of his subjects. For proof we need only point to the Indians under the rule of the Jesuits in Paraguay.

Slavery unnaturally dissociates the ideas of *labour*, and of *subsistence and enjoyment*. Any clown in England talks of “looking out for work,” and grieves at being “out of work”—thereby meaning wages. Now the most intelligent slave can have no such association in his mind. But the Carolinian regards slavery as an excellent *training*. What then, we ask, is its end? Children are kept in a state of implicit submission, and compulsory training, on purpose that they may grow up into men fit to take

care of themselves; and slaves it seems *on purpose* that they may not.

Mrs. Stowe has perceived (what is often overlooked) the peculiar difficulty, arising from his condition, in giving such moral lessons to the negro as shall be consistent with slave institutions. She puts the remark into the mouth of St. Clare, the intellectual, the refined, the humane and generous St. Clare, who would have been the great and the noble but for

"Things incomplete and purposes betrayed,
The saddest transits o'er truth's mystic glass."

He says, "As to honesty, the slave is kept in that dependent semi-childish state, that there is no making him realize the rights of property, or feel that his master's goods are not his own, if he can get them. For my part, I don't see how they *can* be honest." Most persons would say, teach the slave that theft is a sin—granted, but he will deny that it is a theft. It is enemy's property, and fair spoil. He is not a member of the community. It is a hostile one.

"Think'st thou we will not sally forth,
To spoil the spoiler as we may,
And from the robber rend the prey."

His master has stolen *him*, or at least is a receiver. And he will ask whether if you were taken prisoner by bandits, and either kept by them or transferred by them to others—you would, though you might be deterred by *fear* in some cases from attempting to escape, feel any scruple of conscience—any doubt of the *right*—to mount their best horse and ride off! Such is the slave's case. You cannot prove to him that he has not a fair right to anything (including himself) belonging to his master, or to any other member of the community which is hostile to him. It is not coveting one's neighbour's goods to sue another for damages for false imprisonment.

It is this impossibility of reconciling moral right with the institutions of slavery, that causes the peculiar difficulty of imparting moral instruction to the negro, and makes the slaveholder so averse to its being even attempted. Thus it is that most missionaries, except the Moravians, have made slaves discontented and rebellious. For when men acquire any notion of justice, they apply it very readily universally: and assuredly the negroes might well inquire why *their* prescriptive title to traffic in the personal effects of their master, or to dispose of his person, should be one degree less inviolate than that of the master to trade upon their flesh and blood. It is not quite so easy a matter to give a negro as clear ideas of the *meum* and *tuum* as Mrs. Eastman's Aunt Phillis had. "I am an honest woman," she says, "and not in the habit of *taking* anything. I would

not *take* my freedom." We might easily shew that a similar difficulty stands in the way of inculcating any other moral precept.

But, how then do the Moravian missionaries proceed? And how did Paul proceed? How did he freely instruct slaves, while guarding his instructions against anything tending to a servile war? We find that Paul based his exhortations to them, as indeed to all his Christian converts, on the duty of not *raising a prejudice against the gospel*. If respect for authority is to be inculcated, it is thus he urges it:—"Let as many servants as are under the yoke count their masters worthy of all honour, that the name of God and his doctrine be not blasphemed." Are honesty and fidelity urged?—they are urged on the same ground: "Not purloining, but shewing all good fidelity, that they may *adorn the doctrine* of God our Saviour in all things." It has been well said that "the christian system is one which substitutes sublime principles for exact rules." And the apostles, while labouring constantly to inculcate these principles, left men who had embraced them (as Dr. Hinds remarks in his "History of the Origin of Christianity") to rectify their institutions accordingly for themselves. They carefully abstained from politics—that is, from all direct interference with social institutions. Every political question may be made out to be somehow connected with religion; but the apostles were not satisfied with abstaining from all interference with whatever had no connexion with religion; they abstained from any direct interference even with current politics, in the works of their christian mission. They shew, by their example, that it is not the office of the Church of Christ to ally itself with any *one* party in the community; but rather to permeate all human society, by an indirect (often unconscious) influence and reconciling power. But if this silence of the apostles on the special and individual application to slavery of the principles they inculcated, be the sanction for the system, as some American slaveholders maintain it is, then *despotism* is as much sanctioned by Scripture as *slavery*. The American defenders of slavery will scarcely like to accept this conclusion from their premisses: and yet certain it is that the tyranny of Nero is as much sanctioned by this silence, and by the apostolic exhortations to "honour the king," as the oppression of the slave.

If, then, there be no sanction for slavery in this apostolic silence and submission, as regards the then existing institution of slavery, we assuredly cannot find it in the principles, the motives, and the examples which the New Testament sets before us. We need not multiply commonplace quotations. Indeed it seems that the inconsistency of slavery with the spirit and general principles of Christianity was clearly seen by the

legislators of South Carolina themselves; for one of the first articles of the code organizing slavery contains a formal declaration, "that a slave who shall be baptized is in nowise, in virtue thereof, to be given his freedom."* But the *Carolinian*, as the organ of the southern slaveholders, declares the system to be of God, and regards it as the "five talents" committed to them, which it "would be a weak and wicked prayer to ask to be taken from them." Indeed, such stress do slaveholders lay upon the divine sanction, that it would seem as if they were such only in homage to religion. But such homage to the Prince of Peace—to Him with "the easy yoke and the light burden"—to Him who "takes the lambs in his bosom, and gently leads those that are with young,"—such tribute pours foul scorn on Him, and reminds us rather of the "purple robe," and the "reed," and the mocking.

But it is suggested that the relation of the slave to his master may even be a spring of moral elevation, generating great blessings, and becoming a relation of kindness and charity "eminently calculated to give rise to the christian virtues,"—that thus the very spirit of Christianity may be incorporated in the actual system of slavery. While among the New Englanders the poor are only occasionally seen, and that chiefly by the humane Jews, the slaveholders, having the poor always with them, are in a position that promotes their active usefulness, at some sacrifice perhaps of their romantic sensibilities. Is this meant for an illustration of Butler's well-known doctrine of the active and passive habits? ought not the Bishop then to have enjoined us to keep slaves chained to our hall-doors, in order to secure an increase of our "active usefulness," even at the expense of our romantic feelings?

As to the argument, that slavery was from the first intended as the fulfilment of God's curse upon the descendants of Canaan, we can only say; that however little we may desire to feel as Mrs. Eastman says Aunt Phillis did under her full conviction of this—as if burning in Hecla, though fully submitting to the inevitable decree—yet we still less envy the feelings of those slaveholders who are content to believe themselves the fulfillers—the executioners—of a curse on their fellow-men. But it does seem a strange perversion to turn a prophecy of evil into a precept to commit it. On this shewing, the Pharaohs were obedient servants of God in evil-entreating his people, and the Jews were justified in their crime against Him whom they crucified.

There is one point more in the *Carolinian's* pamphlet which we must notice. He has taken advantage of a fallacy put by

* *Laws of South Carolina, Digest ii., Slaves, p. 210.*

Mrs. Stowe into St. Clare's mouth, but merely for the purpose of putting the slaveholder's most plausible argument in the most plausible way. He states that a *capitalist* is virtually a slave-owner as much as a Virginian planter, since, with the employed in England, it is only "work or be starved," instead of "work or be flogged." This fallacy, the slaveholder catches at, "glad," as Mrs. Stowe says, "of any fig-leaf of covering from the intolerable blaze of the scorn of civilized humanity." He makes up his mind that "this power that slavery gives to one man over another is met with everywhere in society," that all the actual misery and degradation of the slave is nothing more than what is to be found in all countries, and that it is as vain to contend against what he believes to be an absolute decree of Providence, in regard to the constitution of society, as it is to contend against storms, earthquakes, and blights. He admits that the slave is wretched and degraded, but he takes comfort to himself in pointing to human Beings still more debased. Indeed, the way this argument is pushed, would seem to imply that *better* must always mean *good*. But it is totally false that the condition of the slave is not infinitely worse than that of the poorest labourer in England. Indeed, it must be so, as long as a position in which evil is *legally inevitable*, is worse than that in which it *may lawfully be avoided*. If our poor are effectually taught to lay by when they have good wages, not to marry improvidently, not to bring up their children in ignorance, not to join trade-unions, (a horrible slavery, but self-imposed,) and to guard against various other things prejudicial to their well-being and dependent upon themselves to avoid, their condition will indefinitely improve. No *legislative* restriction sets any limit to that improvement. If a man be not "straitened in himself," the law of the land does not straiten him, nor does any impassable barrier narrow up his career. The man of the lowest grade in England *may* attain any position, not hereditary. And in these days of philanthropic effort, amid many deplorable social evils, much effort, wise and unwise, is making to impart to our poor that knowledge, and to encourage them to the exercise of that forethought, which would give them self-dependence and self-respect.

An American writer of a book, entitled "England's Glory and her Shame," gives the result of his (supposed) observations during a "tour in the *manufacturing districts* of England," and draws a most appalling picture of the misery and degradation of the manufacturers; to the great consolation, no doubt, of the American slave-owners, who are thus left satisfied that if slavery is a bad thing, there is no alternative but something worse. Now, we happen to have ascertained, through the medium of a gentleman who personally knew the author, that he *never set*

foot in Europe, but concocted his work partly from Blue-books, and perhaps partly from imagination.

It must, however, be added, in fairness to the author, that he was probably not aware of the amount of misrepresentation some of these Blue-books contain. They are the Reports of the Evidence taken before the Committee on the Ten-hours' Bill—a work which too much resembled a supposed botanical examination of a certain farm and garden, resulting in a collection of a few nettles out of one field, and four or five thistles out of another, and a handful of groundsel from the garden; representing these as *the produce of the estate*.

But we shall place before our readers a short digest of slave-laws of the South and West, and ask them to contrast the condition to which the slave is shut up by law in America, with that of the very poorest freeman in a free country. If the following statement does not exhibit what American slaveholders *actually* practise, it shews at least what it is *possible* for them to practise, within the limit of American law.

"1. Slavery is hereditary and perpetual, to the last moment of the slave's earthly existence, and to all his descendants to the latest posterity.

"2. The labour of the slave is compulsory and uncompensated; while the kind of labour, the amount of toil, the time allowed for rest, are dictated solely by the master. No bargain is made, no wages given. A proud despotism governs the human brute; and even his covering and provender, both as to quantity and quality, depend entirely on the master's discretion. To use the language of Judge Stroud, 'The slave is entirely under the control of his master—is unprovided with a protector—and, especially, he cannot be a witness or make complaint in any known mode against his master.'

"3. The slave being considered a personal chattel may be sold, or pledged, or leased, at the will of his master. He may be exchanged for marketable commodities, or taken in execution for the debts or taxes either of a living or dead master. Sold at auction, either individually or in lots to suit the purchaser. He may remain with his family, or be separated from them for ever.

"4. Slaves can make no contracts, and have no legal right to any property, real or personal. Their own honest earnings, and the legacies of friends, belong in point of law to their masters.

"5. Neither a slave nor a free coloured person can be a witness against any *white* or free person in a court of justice, however atrocious may have been the crimes they have seen him commit, if such testimony would be for the benefit of a *slave*; but they may give testimony against a *fellow slave*, or free coloured man. Even in cases affecting life, if the *master* is to reap the advantage of it.

"6. The slave may be punished at his master's discretion—without trial—without any means of legal redress; whether his offence be real or imaginary; and the master can transfer the same despotic power to any person or persons he may choose to appoint.

"7. The slave is not allowed to resist any free man under *any* circumstances; *his* only safety consists in the fact that his *owner* may bring suit and recover the price of his body, in case his life is taken, or his limbs rendered unfit for labour.

"8. Slaves cannot redeem themselves, or obtain a change of masters, though cruel treatment may have rendered such a change necessary for their personal safety.

"9. The slave is entirely unprotected in his domestic relations.

"10. The laws greatly obstruct the manumission of slaves, even where the master is willing to enfranchise them.

"11. The operation of the laws tends to deprive slaves of religious instruction and consolation.

"12. The whole power of the laws is exerted to keep slaves in a state of the lowest ignorance.

"13. There is in this country a monstrous inequality of law and right. What is a trifling fault in a *white* man, is considered highly criminal in the *slave*; the same offences which cost a white man a few dollars only are punished in the negro with death."

A word, in conclusion, in reference to Uncle Tom himself and his history. If there is nothing in American law to justify any presumption against the truth of this picture, neither is there anything in human nature to prevent the possibilities of the law from being converted into realities of social life. Cases strikingly similar to Uncle Tom are not unknown, though it is said that Mrs. Stowe in portraying the meekly heroic old man has drawn altogether on her fancy. We have been furnished with a case of actual occurrence, which we offer as proof that this exhibition of Christian principle and devotedness unto death is not without a parallel:—

"In the summer of 1849," says the editor of the *Pittsburg Visitor*, "we were in Louisville, Kentucky. As no great change has ever taken place in our opinion on this slavery question, we were at some loss then for a place to go to preaching, and used on Sabbath to walk out to a grave-yard, or into the fields, or up and down the streets in search of sermons.

"One forenoon passing a little church from whence the sound of singing arose, Brother Samuel, who was with us, remarked that it was a congregation of Methodists, and a missionary station, and that he had once dropped in there and heard a sermon he liked.

"We went in and took a seat. A plain-looking elderly man preached in the style usual for Methodist preachers in country places—all about religion—its comforts in life, and triumphs in death. He insisted, with great earnestness, that it was a 'great thing to be a Christian.' Religion—it made the weak strong, and the meanest most honourable. To illustrate this grand truth he told an anecdote, as something coming within the range of his own knowledge, of an old slave who had 'got religion.' His master was kind, but irreligious and reckless, and was withal much impressed by the earnestness

of his servant's prayers and exhortations. But one day, one evil day, on Sabbath, too, this same kind master, was drinking, and playing cards with a visitor, when the conversation turned upon the religion of slaves. The visitor boasted that he could 'whip the religion out of any nigger in the State in half an hour.' The master, proud of possessing a rare specimen, boasted that he had one out of whom the religion could not be whipped. A bet was laid, and the martyr summoned. A fearful oath of recantation and blasphemous denial of his Saviour was required of the old disciple, upon pain of being whipped to death. The answer was, 'Bless de Lord, Massa, I can't.' Threats, oaths, entreaties, and noise were tried, but he fell on his knees, and holding up his hands, pleaded, 'Bless de Lord, Massa, I can't. Jesus, he die for me. Massa, please Massa, I can't.' The executioner summoned his aids, the old man was tied up, and the whipping commenced; but the shrieks for mercy were all intermingled with prayers and praises—prayers for his own soul and those of his murderers. When fainting and revived, the terms of future freedom from punishment were offered again and again; he put them away with the continued exclamation, 'Jesus, he die for me; Bless de Lord, Massa, I can't.' The bet was to the full value of the property endangered. The men were flushed with wine, and the experimenter on nigger religion insisted upon trying it out. Honour demanded he should have a fair chance to win his bet; and the old disciple died under the lash, blessing the Lord that Jesus had died for him!

"The preacher gave his recital with many tears, and before he was done we do not think there was a dry eye, except our own in the house. Our pulses all stood still with horror, but the speaker did not appear to dream that his story had any bearing against the institutions with which he was surrounded.

"We cannot remember how he said the particulars came to his knowledge, but think the martyr had been under his pastoral care, and that he got the minute from slave witnesses in 'love-feast.'

"He gave us the story simply to shew what a good thing religion was. Of those who heard it, and the many persons there to whom we related it, we found not one who appeared to doubt it. Any indignation felt and expressed was against the individual actors in the tragedy."

We are compelled by our limits, to bring this article to a close—not by having exhausted, or nearly exhausted, the subject. In fact, the most *practical* part of it remains behind. We shall perhaps return to it on some future occasion. Meantime, we beg to assure all really humane and christian Americans, whether Northern or Southern, that we have written "more in sorrow than in anger;" that we sincerely wish their deliverance from the truly difficult position in which they are placed, and that we are actuated by no spirit of hostile rivalry, but have endeavoured to speak the truth in love.

- ART. VIII.—1. *Twelfth General Report of the Colonial Land and Emigration Commissioners.* Presented to Parliament by Command. London, 1852.
2. *Practical Instructions to Boards of Guardians, as to the Emigration of Poor Persons at the Cost of the Poor Rate.* By W. G. LUMLEY. London, 1852.
3. *Correspondence relating to Emigration from the Highlands and Islands of Scotland.* Parliamentary Paper. London, 1852.
4. *Memoir and Labours of Caroline Chisholm.* London, 1852.

EMIGRATION is the natural method by which old countries are to be relieved, and new countries to be peopled; the operation designed by Providence for at once mitigating the evils of civilisation and eradicating those of barbarism; the mode of transferring the surplus wealth and population which in the course of time have become a burden instead of a benefit in the limited field of employment where they had their origin, to lands which need nothing but this transfer to be converted from a wilderness into a garden; the means of spreading over the globe those arts, those luxuries, that knowledge, that religion, those literary and scientific achievements, in a word, that aggregate of social gains which have sprung up in remote and specially favoured centres of human existence. To the more improving and energetic races of men, emigration from an over-crowded home to emptier and more attractive quarters, is as natural and instinctive a movement as swarming is to bees; it is forced upon them by nearly the same necessity; and, if well-timed and wisely conducted, is rewarded by pretty much the same results.

There probably never was a nation to which emigration on a great scale was more urgently suggested than to England in the middle of the nineteenth century—both by difficulties at home and by attractions abroad. Her population and her wealth were rapidly increasing, but the field for the employment of both was limited; the rate of profit was diminishing; the rate of interest was being reduced; all professions were overstocked; distress, in one circle or another, was frequent and recurrent; and in all ranks “the uneasy class” was on the increase. On the other hand, our colonies were clamorous for a supply of labour; they were boundless in extent; they embraced every variety of climate, from the arctic to the tropical; they offered every variety of occupation to the emigrant, from the shepherd to the lumberer; and they promised a field to nearly every description of talent and activity. Above all, they assured to every one

the certainty of an unanxious future. On the one side was an insatiable demand : on the other an inexhaustible supply.

We are not disposed to draw a gloomy picture of the condition of our people. That condition on the whole has greatly improved in the last forty or fifty years. Not only has wealth and luxury greatly increased, but the mass of the community have been more than ever before participators in all those advantages which enterprise and science have created. The consumption of luxuries has greatly augmented among all classes ; the price of food and clothing has diminished ; locomotion has become immensely cheaper, more rapid, and more general ; agriculture has improved ; and commerce and manufactures are still extending and generally flourishing. In the general aspect of the country there is unquestionably much ground for gratitude, and for self-congratulation. But if, descending from the statistical height which has given us this bird's-eye view, we examine the constituents of English society a little in detail, we are perplexed and pained by much that is exceptional or contradictory. The whole community seems to be afflicted with what the French call a sort of *malaise générale* ; and the symptoms of the malady are nearly uniform in each rank. The "uneasy class," as it has been aptly termed, is not a distinct section of the nation, but consists of a vast aggregate of contributions from every section. The highest and the lowest orders alike furnish their quota. All, in every rank, who cannot indulge in the common privilege of humanity, the enjoyment of the domestic ties, without losing their status in society—who can only purchase a wife and children at the cost of every other blessing, and who therefore shrink from the absorbing price—belong to the "uneasy class." Among the aristocracy, those younger sons, whose parents can bequeath to them no adequate income ; whom the exhaustion of the family interest, or the progress of popular retrenchment, cuts off from the old chances of a comfortable sinecure ; who are too poor, too proud, or too unenterprising for the exacting occupations of commerce ; who, if they enter the Church, have no fat family living to inherit, and feel no superior capacities by which to carve their way to a prebend or a bishopric, who know that the army or the navy, though an honourable profession, is scarcely ever wealth, and seldom even livelihood, to any but the favoured children of fortune ; whose talents at the bar—where they would have to meet the competition of rivals inured to labour, trained to endurance, and stimulated by actual want—would probably never secure them a single brief ; whose only prospect, therefore, is to vegetate on some wretched subordinate post in the administration, or to purchase an income by expatriation as

governor or secretary to some cheerless and uncultured colony,—these are among the contributions of our nobility and gentry to the "uneasy class." The poverty and privations of these unprovided scions of the great are severer than is commonly supposed, and their numbers are very considerable. They have often to live as dependents through the whole of life; they have to maintain the externals not only of gentility but of wealth, on an income barely adequate to the morest needs of high society; by the right and the necessity of birth they live in daily contact with the most enervating and enviable luxury which they must in a manner share and endure, yet scarcely enjoy or grasp; and they are condemned to perpetual celibacy, from the curse of which they can only escape by the low achievement of hunting down an heiress. The junior branches of the other sex are little better off: with hundreds of them the sweet natural ties of wife and mother are felt, at an early age, to be almost unattainable; if they are beautiful they must barter their loveliness for a wealthy suitor; if they have few personal attractions, their probable lot is either to fritter away existence in insipid distractions, or to wither slowly,—wretchedly virtuous—poor lay nuns, torn and shaken by earnest natural affections—unconsoled even by the sad delusions of a religious vocation—a perpetual protest against the great undiscovered wrong or blunder of the world.

As we descend in the social scale the contributions to the "uneasy class" increase. All who are anxious, and with reason, as to their own future or that of their children, belong to it. The farmers, as a body, it is well known, belong to it. They scarcely ever accumulate property: they can seldom even hold their own. People with fixed money incomes have indeed, for many years, been rising in the world, in consequence of the steady and considerable reduction which has taken place in the price of all articles. But the recent discoveries of gold make it questionable whether the tendency henceforth will not set in an opposite direction. People, too, with fixed money incomes have generally small incomes, and the very circumstance that these incomes *are* fixed and incapable of increase, renders their possessors anxious about the future, and fearful of encountering the burden of a family, which they have even fewer facilities than others for placing out in the world. Persons, again, living on the interest of money, have, for a long series of years, found their incomes alarmingly diminished. Five per cent. used to be attainable where three and a half is scarcely to be got now. The profits of trade, too, have fallen off, *pari passu*, with the interest of money. Political economists explain to us that this must be so: any one who will compare his own rate of profit with that which his father tantalizes him by describing as usual in his day,

knows that it is so. Numbers of merchants, manufacturers, and tradesmen belong to the "uneasy class." The year 1847 shewed how even the wealthiest might be reduced to poverty at a stroke. These classes are far more numerous than they used to be; but how few among them feel any real security as to the subsistence or the careers of their children! How frequent and how stern have been the warnings against indulging in any such security! Every merchant knows how difficult it is to place his son in first-rate counting-houses. Every manufacturer knows how difficult it is to find for his son, however diligent and steady, a safe partnership, unless he has a large capital wherewith to purchase it. "The desire to establish children in the world is the same as ever, while the difficulty of accomplishing that object is much greater; since beginners in trade require a much larger capital than formerly to obtain the same income; unfavourable accidents happen as before, while bankruptcies, complete or partial, are more frequent than ever. The existence, therefore, of all those whose incomes are derived from the employment of capital—except great capitalists, who can easily save out of diminished incomes—is a continual struggle with difficulties. How to make the two ends meet; which way to turn; how to provide for one claim without neglecting another; how to escape what they consider degradation; how on earth to manage for their children;—these are the thoughts which trouble and perplex them. The anxious, vexed, or harassed class, would be a better name for them than the milder term which I have used."*

The case is the same in professions: all are overstocked; in all there is the same intense competition; in all there are vast numbers of disappointed votaries; in all the blanks are many and the prizes few. Every year sees fresh clergymen issuing from college, anxious, and often for long years anxious in vain, for a miserable curacy; and reduced to support life by the most strenuous contrivances till they can obtain one. How many never get beyond a curacy! How many pass their whole lives in a ceaseless struggle with embarrassment and want! How many are summoned down from their most aspiring dreams of human regeneration

"To stoop to strive with misery at the door!"

How many find themselves unable, even by the severest labour and the strictest frugality, to escape debt and disgrace!—In the medical profession again, how few are those who grow rich in comparison with those who remain poor! How few are those who make a large income compared with those who make no income

* England and America, i. 98.

at all ! And how many anxious and suffering years have been endured even by the most successful, at the outset of their career ! Probably at least half of those who have embraced this profession have lived during the greater portion of life upon their private fortune, not on their professional gains. Diligence, skill, science, prudence—unless far beyond the average—are unavailing to *secure* practice or emolument. More than average opportunities—more than average good fortune—are needed in addition. The case of the bar is even more dispiriting. Here it is certain that only a minority actually live by their profession. The majority pass the best years of their life sickening in expectation of a brief, though thoroughly acquainted with their profession, unremitting in their application, and inured to any severity of toil. It was, indeed, given in evidence before the Official Salaries Committee, which sat two years ago, that legal business was becoming more diffused than formerly ; and that fewer barristers made enormous fortunes, while a larger number were in receipt of moderate emoluments. Still it is notorious that not more than one-third of those who are annually called ever rise to live by their profession. The same remarks apply to the class of engineers, artists, literary men, and clerks : “Two-thirds of them live by snatching the bread out of each other’s mouths.” The case of governesses speaks volumes ; and volumes of indescribable sadness. A vast proportion of them have never been intended or educated for their occupation, but have been reduced to it by the misfortunes or non-success of their families. Numbers of them have fallen suddenly—numbers more have sunk gradually—from the easy into the uneasy class. They are now to be had of any character, with any acquirements, on almost any terms. Every one who advertises is embarrassed and overwhelmed by the multitude of the applicants. And for what ? For the wages of a butler or a London footman ; and for a situation in some cases—be it said with pain and shame—more equivocal and ignominious.

Now, in all these instances the root of the evil is identical. The labourers are too many for the vineyard. The hands are seeking for the work, instead of the work being clamorous for the hands to do it. For every job there are two applicants ; and, of the two, one only can be employed and fed. Notwithstanding the vast increase in our national wealth ; notwithstanding the multiplied and daily multiplying wants which our luxurious civilisation has engendered,—the field of employment is still too limited for the numbers who are crowding into it. Hence the severity of competition ; hence the intensity of pursuit necessary to success in any line ; hence the uncertainty of victory even to the best-strung energies. Hence that sad aspect

which, amid all its more glorious features, English society presents,—of a race of men, capable of a higher destiny, meant for calmer enjoyment and for nobler aims, to whom life is not a pilgrimage but a race,—whose whole existence, from the cradle to the grave, is one breathless hurry—a crush, a struggle, and a strife!

Things do not brighten as we go down. The agricultural labourers, who may now number about a million, exclusive of their families, have long been in a condition which is at once a grief, a perplexity, and a reproach. It is not that they are worse off now than formerly,*—we believe the reverse to be unquestionable—but still their state is to the last degree unsatisfactory; and has been so, time out of mind. In some counties they are more prosperous and better paid than in others: generally speaking, their position deteriorates in proportion as agriculture is the only occupation of the district. The labourers are better off in the north than in the south. In Lancashire, Yorkshire, Cumberland, and Westmoreland, they have in ordinary times not much to complain of. In Dorsetshire and Devonshire they seem to be permanently wretched. In Leicestershire and Lincolnshire the wages are often regular and ample: in Buckinghamshire and Bedfordshire, they are seldom such as adequately to support life. But as a whole it is, we fear, indisputable that the usual earnings of the rural day-labourer are not sufficient to provide his family with food, clothing, and habitation, of fitting kind and quantity; life is spent in “the hard struggle of living,”—a struggle successful or unsuccessful, as the case may be; but on either supposition, leaving no leisure for enjoyment or improvement, and offering no possibility of rising; on either supposition, scarcely an existence suitable for men with intellects, souls, and human affections,—scarcely an existence which we can bear to regard as the normal and inevitable one for large classes of our countrymen.

If from rural we turn to artisan life, we find evils of a different, but scarcely less lamentable sort. As a rule, the *employed* artisans are in receipt of earnings which, rightly spent, might support them in comfort, raise them above want, provide for the future, and often elevate them into the class of capitalists. But great numbers of them—perhaps the majority—are reckless and wasteful: they make no provision for future vicissitudes; and

* In the whole of this picture it must be borne in mind that we are describing the English community, not precisely as it presents itself to our observation in this autumn of 1852, when emigration, free trade, and a succession of good harvests, have combined to place all classes—especially the labourers—for the time, in a condition of unusual comfort and prosperity: we are delineating England as it averaged in the aggregate from 1840 to 1850.

when reverses come, they are as destitute as if they had never known what wealth was. The people engaged in the iron works of Wales and Monmouthshire, in the hardware trades of Birmingham and its vicinity, and in the manufacture of Lancashire and Cheshire, are specimens of this class. Others, again, as the handloom weavers of Lancashire, Paisley, and Spitalfields, are either always or periodically in distress; their numbers are greater than the regular demand for their productions can support; sometimes they can find no employment; at other times they are compelled to work excessive hours in order to scrape together wages adequate for their subsistence. There are some localities (as in Leicestershire for example) where distress has arisen from the dying out or the removal of a once lucrative trade. But throughout a great body of the artisan population, the complaint—made less by them than for them; true to a great extent, but to a great extent also self-caused—is the same: their toil is so incessant and severe, as to leave no time nor wish for anything but sleep, and to render their life an alarming approximation to that of the brutes that perish.

There is yet another class, of whose condition fearful pictures have of late been laid before the world—the distressed work-people of large towns—the distressed needlewomen; the distressed tailors; the distressed bootmakers, and others, who, in the very midst of wealth, are said to be in destitution and squalor indescribable; in the midst of freedom to be actually and physically in bondage as savage and inescapable as that of the American negro. These classes are said to number some thousands in the metropolis alone; and their sufferings and privations to be such as can scarcely be credited in a civilized and Christian country. Nor, whatever may be our opinion as to the causes of their wretchedness, or the undue colouring thrown over it, can we refuse to believe in the general fact of its existence.

There was enough, one would have thought, in such a state of things as we have described, to induce whole swarms of our countrymen to leave the old world, where they were so anxious and so wretched, and flock to those more favoured scenes where a cordial welcome awaited them, and where at least they might feel secure of ample subsistence and an improving future. But many difficulties and deterrents stood in the way. The educated and refined classes, painful and anomalous as was often their position here, shrunk from leaving behind them all the elegancies of polished life, all the amenities of cultivated society, and plunging into scenes where success must be purchased by unremitting toil and frequent and cheerless isolation; where

the gentleman and the labourer were nearly on a level, and sometimes the latter had even the advantage; and where those, who in England had belonged to the ruling class, would often find themselves at the mercy and under the control of meddling and vulgar officials. The industrious classes, whose education had taught them little of any country but their own, were alarmed at the length of the voyage, and the distance of the colony, and had formed exaggerated notions of the dangers and embarrassments which attend the emigrant life—of the contest with savage nature and savage men. The destitute did not know how to go, and for many years no arrangements were made to facilitate their transfer. Emigration therefore proceeded but slowly, though at an increasing rate: some new and extraordinary stimulants were wanting to give an impulse to the movement adequate to the requirements of the case. These stimulants Providence sent, in the famine in Ireland and the Highlands, and the gold discoveries in Australia. The effect of these in giving vigour and expansion to the previously languid exodus from our shores, may be seen from the following table, from which it appears that in twenty-two years, from 1825 to 1846 inclusive, the emigration from the United Kingdom was only 1,480,000, or about 67,300 yearly, whereas in the five years from 1847 to 1851, it has been 1,422,670, or more than 284,500 per annum.*

* England is not the only country which is relieving herself largely of her surplus population. The emigration from Germany is at the present moment, and has been for some years, most extensive and systematic. The Germans emigrate mainly to the United States, and go in whole villages and communities at once, taking their clergymen with them, and having generally sent over some one before-hand to survey the promised land, and to make purchases and preparation for them. We have no means of ascertaining the numbers who have gone with any exactness, but they are estimated at 400,000 in recent years. The Central Emigration Society of Germany gives the numbers who sailed in 1852 as follows :—

From Bremen,	37,943
„ Hamburg,	18,127
„ Havre,	35,000
„ Rotterdam,	3,000
„ Antwerp,	9,243

Total,	103,313
--------	---------

Carrying with them on an average 200 Thalers, or about £30 each, or a total of £3,000,000.

**EMIGRATION FROM THE UNITED KINGDOM FROM 1825
TO 1851, INCLUSIVE.**

Years.	North American Colonies.	United States.	Australia and New Zealand.	All other Places.	Total.
1825	8,741	5,551	485	114	14,891
1826	12,818	7,063	903	116	20,900
1827	12,648	14,526	715	114	28,003
1828	12,084	12,817	1,056	135	26,092
1829	13,307	15,678	2,016	197	31,198
1830	30,574	24,887	1,242	204	56,907
1831	58,067	23,418	1,561	114	83,160
1832	66,339	32,872	3,733	196	103,140
1833	28,808	29,109	4,093	517	62,527
1834	40,060	33,074	2,800	288	76,222
1835	15,573	26,720	1,860	325	44,478
1836	34,226	37,774	3,124	293	75,417
1837	29,884	36,770	5,054	326	72,034
1838	4,577	14,332	14,021	292	33,222
1839	12,658	33,536	15,786	227	62,207
1840	32,293	40,642	15,850	1,958	90,743
1841	38,164	45,017	32,625	2,786	118,592
1842	54,123	63,852	8,534	1,835	128,344
1843	23,518	28,335	3,478	1,881	57,212
1844	22,924	43,660	2,229	1,873	70,686
1845	31,803	58,538	830	2,330	93,501
1846	43,439	82,239	2,347	1,826	129,851
1847	109,680	142,154	4,949	1,487	258,270
1848	31,065	188,233	23,904	4,887	248,089
1849	41,367	219,450	32,091	6,590	299,498
1850	32,961	223,078	16,037	8,773	280,849
1851	42,605	267,357	21,532	4,472	335,966
Total,	884,306	1,750,682	222,955	44,056	2,901,999

This year the emigration promises to be greater still. The following are the numbers who have gone out in the first six months of 1852 :—

To the United States,	136,204
British North America,	19,453
Australian Colonies,	25,810
All other Places,	1,519

182,986

This is at the rate of 365,972 for the whole year, or exactly 1000 a day.

Let us now give attention for a few moments to the mode in which this emigration proceeds, and to the various arrangements which have been made to promote and facilitate it.

First, with regard to the emigration from Ireland, which is two-thirds of the whole. Of 335,966 who left the United Kingdom in 1851, 257,372 are stated to have been Irish; and of the 182,986 who have emigrated in the first six months of 1852, not less than 126,000 are Irish. There are two peculiar features about this Irish exodus. The first is, that nearly the whole of it is directed to the United States, either directly or through Canada. The *precise* numbers we have no means of ascertaining; but from data furnished by the Emigration Commissioners, (at pp. 11 and 13 of their last Report, which we have placed at the head of this Article,) we may calculate, that of the 257,372 who left Ireland last year, not less than 230,000 went to the United States. The second feature goes far to explain the first. Nearly the whole of the emigration from Ireland is conducted by funds furnished either by the emigrants themselves or by their friends in America. A few of the Irish proprietors have assisted their former tenants to escape to a more fortunate country, as a humane and peaceful method of effecting the necessary clearance of their estates, and the Emigration Commissioners have, in the course of ten years, aided 34,052 to reach Australia; but by far the greater proportion of the passage-money of the Irish emigrants has been sent over from America. The sums remitted for this purpose, which the Commissioners have been enabled to trace, amounted, in

1848,	to upwards of	£460,000
1849,	...	540,000
1850,	...	957,000
1851,	...	990,000

Now, the average expense of reaching the Australian colonies is about £15 a-head; that of emigrating to America does not exceed £4. Everything therefore combines to direct Irish emigration to the United States—the comparative cheapness of the transit, the fact that both the means and the attraction are furnished by their relatives who have preceded them, and added to these motives, we fear, is the strongly operative one of a desire to escape from the hated domination of the Saxons.

The emigration movement next in importance is that conducted by the "Colonial Land and Emigration Commissioners," who are supplied with funds from the Cape and the Australian colonies (chiefly arising from the sale of land) for the purpose

of affording a free (or nearly free) passage thither to such emigrants as they shall deem suitable. Between 1847 and 1851 inclusive, about £800,000 had been thus expended, and 62,664 persons have been sent. The funds in the hands of the Commissioners are increasing, and their operations are beginning to be on a proportionately extensive scale. The discovery of gold has given an enormous stimulus to emigration to this quarter, and it appears probable that its entire amount (assisted and unassisted) will this year reach 50,000 against 21,000 last year.

There are three or four New Zealand colonies, each of which has its special corresponding society at home; they sent out last year an aggregate of 2677 emigrants.

But perhaps the most useful and the best conducted of all the emigration arrangements of this country is that which has been set on foot for transferring a portion of the population of the Western Highlands and the Hebrides to Australia. These districts, which had long been both poor and overpeopled, had suffered from the potato failure, in the same manner and nearly to the same extent as Ireland. Like Ireland they were inhabited by Celts—far more peaceful and manageable, indeed, than their brethren over the Channel, but equally impoverished and unenergetic. They lived in the same way, on small crofts or farms, divided and subdivided as the families increased, keeping sometimes a cow, sometimes a few sheep, but subsisting mainly on potatoes and fish, and on the wages they could obtain in the Lowlands as agricultural labourers. Their numbers had become sadly redundant, and their condition very wretched, before the famine of 1846 and the succeeding years came to give them the *coup-de-grace*. Since that period they had been to a great extent supported by charity—a system which rapidly dried up their few remaining resources, and sapped their little remaining energy. Last year it became obvious that nothing but emigration on a large scale could save them. It is calculated that from 25,000 to 30,000 will have to be removed before the population in those barren and rocky districts will be reduced to an amount commensurate with their indigenous resources. At the same time the gold discoveries in Australia, by attracting away a large proportion of the herdsmen of the great grazing establishments, alarmed the proprietors of that colony for the safety of their flocks and the preservation of their yearly supply of wool. An urgent and sudden demand was made upon the mother country for some thousand shepherds. Now it happens that the Highlanders, both from taste and habit, are admirably adapted for this occupation. They are less fitted than either the English or the Lowlander for the steady and laborious pursuits of tillage; but the wild, rough, and compara-

tively easy life of the keepers of sheep and cattle exactly suited them. A society was therefore formed, under the skilful and energetic superintendence of Sir John McNeill and Sir Charles Trevelyan, for removing the superabundant population of the Western Highlands to the Australian colonies. Subscriptions were raised, and an Act of Parliament to facilitate aid from the Highland proprietors was passed. The arrangements made were most judicious and complete. Calculating on and respecting the strong family affections which are so marked a feature in the Gaelic race, and arguing that a shepherd surrounded with his wife and children in the bush would be far less likely than a single settler to desert his post for the feverish attractions of "the diggings,"—it was decided to send out whole families together. This made them both more willing to go, and more valuable and more reliable when they arrived. Moreover it was found that old men, though past the full vigour necessary for the severe labours of agriculture, would be still serviceable as shepherds from their steadiness and experience. Accordingly the Emigration Commissioners agreed to relax their rules as to passage-money, and to afford the whole family, young and old, a (partially) free passage to Australia at the expense of the colony, the deposit payable by the emigrant (in aid of the passage-money) rising with the tender or advanced age of the individual. This deposit, and the necessary outfit and the transmission to the port of embarkation, are provided in the proportion of *one-third* by the proprietor, whose estate is thus relieved of a heavy burden, and *two-thirds* by the general subscription. But in order at once to prevent the exhaustion of the funds thus obtained, and to prevent the injurious and demoralizing effects upon the emigrant of reliance on eleemosynary aid, a promissory note is required from him before he goes on board, by which he engages to pay back the amount advanced to him, by fixed instalments, the details of which are to be arranged with him by the society's correspondents in the colony, and which are to be deducted from his wages by the master by whom he is employed. In consideration of his entering into this engagement and keeping it, the society promises to charge no interest on the sum advanced, and to forego acting on the promissory note, which was made *payable on demand*. If, however, the emigrant should quit the ship, and escape with his outfit, or when arrived out should attempt to abscond to "the diggings," or should refuse to take regular employment, the promissory note can be at once acted upon. By this means, it is expected that nearly the whole of the advances will be recovered in little more than a year, and be available for new emigrants. The society has this year sent out nearly 4000 persons, at an average cost (over and

above the passage-money afforded by the colony, and their own private resources) of about £3 a head; and it hopes every year to send out an equal or greater number till the population of the Western Highlands shall have been brought down to a level with the means of subsistence which those barren regions can supply.

For many years back there has been a considerable amount of emigration partially or wholly conducted by parochial funds. By the 4th and 5th of William IV. c. 76, parishes were authorized to borrow money on the security of their rates for the purpose of aiding such of their poor as might be willing to emigrate, whether paupers or not. Under this Act the following numbers have been aided to emigrate:—

	Persons.		Persons.
Up to the year 1836	5,521	Brought over,	11,855
In 1836	1,189	In 1844	900
1837	754	1845	750
1838	726	1846	208
1839	529	1847	} 1,294
1840	613	1848	
1841	729	1849	1,576
1842	936	1850	1,962
1843	858	1851	1,840
	<hr/>		<hr/>
Carry over,	11,855	Total,	20,385

This year, however, another parochial movement has commenced which may become extensive and serviceable. The parish of St. Martin's-in-the-field has discovered that pauper families may be transported to Australia and fairly settled there for life, at the same cost as would only support them for a year at home. The rate-payers have therefore consented to a special rate of one penny in the pound for the purpose of thus removing those who have become chargeable, and who are willing to be removed to a more hopeful scene. They have just sent off the first shipload of sixty emigrants in good health and spirits, at a total cost of about £1000, or about £16 a head.

The name of Mrs. Chisholm is widely known to all who are interested in Australian colonization. This excellent, judicious, and able lady, has probably done more than any one individual to protect emigrants, and to render emigration easy and attractive. Her first undertaking was the establishment of a "Home for female emigrants" in Sydney, where young women were received on their first arrival, and retained till suitable situations could be found for them, and were thus saved from the almost certain ruin which awaited them, if left to their own resources, and compelled to find quarters for themselves. Her next step

was to establish affiliated "Homes" in the interior; and she was in the habit of travelling long distances into the bush with batches of her *protégées*, and locating them all, one after another, in respectable families. Her exertions soon procured her aid from settlers, and the confidence of emigrants, and men as well as women used to apply to her to find them situations; while of those already doing well in the world, many would apply to her to send them servants, and some to recommend and choose them wives. From first to last she has succeeded in establishing 11,000 emigrants in comfortable situations, as well as in founding an institution and a system which, it may be hoped, will long survive. It is not easy indeed to overestimate either her merits or her services. She is now in England; and has set on foot a society for enabling families to emigrate altogether, and thus avoid those painful separations so common under the old system when the young and unencumbered only were taken,) which so greatly both retarded it and added to its hardships. She has not only enabled numbers of wives to rejoin their emigrant husbands, and children their emigrant parents, but has arranged a most admirable system by which young men and women go out, not as formerly, isolated and unprotected, but under the wing of respectable families; while Captain Chisholm remains in Australia to watch over the location of the emigrants whom his excellent lady thus consigns to him.

Finally, there remains for notice the Female Emigration Society, started by Mr. Sidney Herbert. This was first established with a view of providing a remote and respectable home for those destitute needlewomen of worthy character, on whose behalf public sympathy had recently been so largely aroused. We have no wish to speak of the difficulties which the founders of this society experienced in finding fit objects for their benevolence. In spite of these difficulties they have sent out, and we believe placed respectably and comfortably in Australia, a considerable number of females. They still continue their exertions, but we believe on Mrs. Chisholm's plan, and with her aid.*

Under the combined influence of the various inducements and facilities we have enumerated, emigration from the United Kingdom has now reached a height which begins to excite considerable alarm in the minds of many. It appears as if the old country had reached its culminating point, in population at least, and must henceforth decline. On a rough estimate it seems that the emigrants at least equal the addition to our numbers by the surplus of births over deaths; and in Ireland very

* It is gratifying to know that of 319,000 steerage emigrants in 1851, 147,000 were women.

considerably exceed this addition. "If this drain goes on, how (it is asked) shall we recruit our army? how find an adequate supply of labourers and servants? how meet the increased cost of agriculture? how maintain our manufacturing superiority in the face of rising wages and augmented cost of production?" Let us look all these dangers fairly in the face, and examine them a little in detail; for it is most important that we should ascertain as far as may be, the future that is before us, and that the public mind should be harassed by no vague or unfounded fears.

The case of Ireland must be considered separately. The facts are concisely these. By the combined effect of emigration and famine, the population of Ireland was reduced from 8,175,124 in 1841 to 6,515,794 in 1851. But as there is every reason to believe that up to 1846, when the potato-rot first appeared, the previous moderate rate of annual increase (about half per cent.) had been maintained, the real amount of depopulation in the five years from 1846 to 1851, was from 8,379,500 to 6,575,794, or 372,740 per annum. The stream of emigration which set in from Ireland after the famine, has ever since continued to flow at an accelerated rate. The tie of affection to the old country seems to have been fairly broken; the attractions of the New World are annually increasing, as friends and relatives multiply on the other side of the Atlantic; the potato rot continues, though in a mitigated form; labour has become scarce, but owing to the absence of capital, wages have not materially risen; farms are every day being consolidated, and estates are every day being cleared; and we are bound to say that we see no reason whatever to believe that the tide of emigration has received, or will yet receive, a check. From 1847 to 1850 inclusive, about 200,000 Irish emigrants annually left their country; in 1851, this number had risen to 257,000; and in the first six months of 1852, 125,000 have gone. Now, the total annual addition to the population by the surplus of births over deaths was from 1831 to 1841, (before any of the recent disturbing causes began to operate,) 65,157. But as for many years back Ireland has been exporting the most healthy and vigorous portion of her children, those in the prime of life by whom mainly multiplication is carried on, the Emigration Commissioners, in their recent Report, estimate that those who remain—being in an unusual and increasing proportion the old, the feeble, and the infantine—do not more than barely *keep up* their numbers. We believe this calculation to be quite correct. It follows, therefore, that the emigration from Ireland represents accurately enough the actual decrease of numbers; in other words, that Ireland is being depopulated at the rate of a QUARTER OF A MILLION *per annum*—a process which, if continued, will empty her entirely in the course of TWENTY-FOUR YEARS.

This is so: yet we avow that we view the process without either alarm or regret. We regard it as both a necessary and a most salutary operation. By no milder process—by no less wholesale exodus—could Ireland be regenerated and refloated. For generations she has had her head under water, and the chief part of her people have been in a state of chronic distress. They have multiplied like rabbits, and cultivated the soil like savages. It was stated ten years ago on the highest official authority, that 2,400,000 were habitually in a state of destitution, and dependent on eleemosynary aid for a considerable portion of the year. The Irish had few manufactures, and were little addicted to fishing. They looked almost exclusively to agriculture for subsistence; and their numbers were immeasurably greater than mere agriculture—especially such agriculture as theirs—could support. We borrow from the Quarterly Review of last December an argument and some figures which place the whole matter in a transparent and irrefragable light. The agricultural counties of England can scarcely maintain their own actual numbers, and do not even profess to support or employ their own increase. The cultivators of the soil have of late years actually diminished: more tillage is carried on with fewer labourers. The surplus and the increase of these counties find employment in other districts and in other occupations: they migrate to the towns; they find engagements in the factories or the railways. Now, the ten most purely agricultural counties in England, with a climate equal to that of Ireland, a far richer soil, and an immeasurably more efficient and productive style of cultivation, find themselves fully peopled (if not overpeopled) with a *population of one individual to four acres*:—Ireland, even with worse land, and with a population already decimated by famine, had in 1851 a *population of one individual to 2½ acres*;—in some districts the allowance was only two acres and a quarter, as will be seen by the following table:—

Provinces.	Statute acres inclusive of Lakes, &c.	Statute acres absolutely unimprovable.	Net available Statute acres.	Population in 1851.	Acres to each Individual.
Ulster, . .	5,262,000	712,000	4,550,000	2,004,289	2·28
Leinster, .	4,825,000	200,000	4,625,000	1,667,771	2·78
Munster, .	5,918,000	873,000	5,040,000	1,831,817	2·79
Connaught,	4,180,000	750,000	3,430,000	1,011,917	3·39
Total Inland,	20,180,000	2,535,000	17,645,000	6,515,794	2·71

In order then to bring agricultural and ill-cultivated Ireland

to a level with agricultural and well-cultivated England, her population must be reduced to 4,500,000, or two millions below its amount in 1851. The tide of emigration may therefore go on at its present rate for at least eight or ten years before it has even done enough. For be it remembered we have in this case *two* evils to remedy—we have not only too many people, but we have the wrong kind of people—we require not only to remove redundant numbers, but to replace them by a more energetic, more aspiring, and more improvable race. The state of things which every patriot and statesman should desire, is a continuous annual emigration (for at least a decade) of 250,000 Catholic Celts, and a simultaneous immigration of 50,000 Protestant Saxons or Scotch. In this direction lies the salvation of Ireland, the peace of England; and the solution of those political, social, and religious difficulties which have so long harassed and perplexed alike the most courageous, the most able, the most conscientious of our rulers. To this point should our most earnest efforts be directed:—not to check or discourage the actual Irish exodus, but to counterbalance it by encouraging a large infusion of more vigorous and hopeful British and Protestant blood.

We are not blind to the many excellent and estimable qualities of the Irish: blended with others, controlled, disciplined, guided by others, they are a useful and serviceable people;—left to their own devices, a prey to their own indolent, slovenly, and improvident tendencies, all history shows how helpless and prone to degenerate they are. They make a bad nation, but admirable ingredients in a nation. It is the same in other regions. Wherever they settle singly among Americans or British, they improve, advance, and civilize; wherever they *congregate*, so as to carry Ireland about with them, they continue what we see them at home. We do not, in saying this, by any means wish to imply that they are an *inferior* race, but simply that they are a *peculiar* one, and not fitted to *stand alone*, being deficient in that restless energy, those indefinite desires, which are the very mainsprings of successful colonization—deficient also in that faculty of self-government and self-control, in the absence of which free institutions can never flourish or be permanently maintained. But when their peculiarities have become modified, and their capacities developed, and their activity directed by an adequate amount of Scotch and English colonization of their country, we may hope to see all their good qualities brought out and *utilized*, and all their bad ones repressed and controlled, till Ireland, so long a “howling wilderness,” shall begin “to blossom like the rose.” This colonization was recommended by Sir Robert Peel; it was attempted by Cromwell; and it is curious enough, that long before their time it was proposed by Lord Bacon, in an elaborate Memoir which he addressed to

James I. in 1606. The chief reason why it has proceeded so slowly is to be found in the inadequate security hitherto afforded to life and property in that unhappy country, in the perpetual outbreaks and disturbances which deter peaceful men from casting in their lot with such an unquiet race. It has now, however, fairly commenced, and will, we doubt not, proceed with accelerated pace. The extent to which it has already gone it is not easy to ascertain; but in many quarters we hear of the settlement both of English and Scotch purchasers of land, and tenant farmers. A short time since, a traveller happening to sit down at an ordinary at Ballina, with a dozen other diners, discovered, in the course of the meal, that *they were every one of them Scotch*. At the recent meeting of the British Association at Belfast, the Earl of Mayo made the following statements. He said that—

“ Having just returned from the west of Ireland, he could bear his testimony to the work of regeneration having begun in the west in a most remarkable manner. It must be gratifying to every one to know that in the west, taking in Galway and Mayo, Englishmen were coming to reside; and what was most singular was, that they went to the uncultivated and not to the cultivated parts. In one of the wildest parts—at Ballycroy—he found a small cottage inhabited by an English gentleman, and he (Lord Mayo) had the curiosity to ask for what reason he had purchased that particular place. His reply was convincing. He considered that, by buying that uncultivated spot, and paying attention to it, he would be able to double his income in a very short time. The place he had purchased was extremely low, flat, and marshy soil, and yet he had succeeded in cultivating some of it, and intended, in consequence of the success of his experiment, to cultivate more. With respect to other parts of Connemara—say from Westport to Clifden—he was surprised to find the number of houses occupied by persons who were almost all Englishmen; and he might add that even in that wild district a very beautiful shop had been opened. It was a business-establishment almost worthy of Regent-street; and he could not help asking himself, on looking at it, how was an individual so unwise as to set up such a shop there? But no doubt Mr. Ellis, when he bought a place, had calculated well, and he was doing wonders in regenerating the people. If they proceeded further they would still find gentlemen coming and spending their money in these wilds. During the short time he (Lord Mayo) had been there, he met hundreds of English people, and there could be no doubt that property would increase remarkably in value.”

On the same occasion Mr. Locke of Dublin read before the Statistical Section a very interesting analysis of the purchases in the Encumbered Estates Court, from which it appeared that 772 estates had been sold to 2355 purchasers, so that the number of proprietors has more than trebled. The following extracts are very interesting, as showing the amount and distribution of English capital that has lately been invested in Ireland:

ACREAGE AND AMOUNTS PURCHASED BY ENGLISH AND SCOTCH
ARRANGED ACCORDING TO PROVINCES.

Provinces.	Acreage.			Purchase-Money.		
	A.	R.	P.	£	s.	d.
Leinster, . .	31,012	0	34	222,385	0	0
Munster, . .	54,342	0	9	362,399	12	6
Ulster, . .	7,385	0	2	55,922	0	0
Connaught, .	310,326	2	9	454,420	0	0
Total, . .	403,065	3	14	1,095,126	12	6

"The fourth table shows the localities from whence the purchase-money came:—London and its vicinity, £720,641, 19s. 2d.; Lancashire, (including £39,276, 13s. 4d. from Liverpool and Birkenhead,) £56,526, 13s. 4d.; Buckinghamshire, £1,220; Cheshire, £53,205; Derbyshire, £2,525; Devonshire, £14,445; Durham, £7,750; Gloucestershire, £11,830; Hampshire, £24,400; Hertfordshire, £11,000; Lincolnshire, £5,490; Norfolk, £16,500; Oxfordshire, £6,280; Pembrokeshire, £3,820; Suffolk, £5,730; Shropshire, £7,690; Sussex, £7,610; Staffordshire, £57,450; Somersetshire, £2,550; Warwickshire, £5,750; Yorkshire, £3,517; Scotland, £46,220; Calcutta, £24,250; Isle of Man, £1,406; America, £2,320; total, £1,100,126, 12s. 6d. The fifth table shows the number and comparative amounts of English and Scotch purchasers—£1000 and under, 24; £1,000 to £2,000, 18; £2,000 to £5,000, 26; £5,000 to £10,000, 21; £10,000 to £20,000, 13; £20,000 and upwards, 12; total, 114. Of these, one purchaser was from Calcutta, amount, £24,250. Three from the Isle of Man, all under £1,200; and eight from Scotland, viz. one between £2,000 and £5,000, and seven between £5,000 and £10,000.

"The sixth table exhibits, as accurately as can be ascertained, the classification of these purchasers: Gentry, including 8 titled persons, 52; manufacturers and merchants, including 8 firms, 36; insurance and land companies, 6; farmers, 20; total, 114.

"Of the eight purchasers from Scotland, two were gentry, and six farmers. It is a fact of considerable importance, as affecting the improvement of the far west, that English and Scotch purchasers, and tenant farmers also, have usually settled in groups. Thus, 63,000 acres of Sir R. O'Donnell's Mayo estate have been purchased by English capitalists, led by Mr. Ashworth, whose work, entitled 'The Saxon in Ireland,' has been of great service to this country. And now a large portion of Erris and the northern shores of Clew Bay is in the possession of Englishmen. Again, in Galway, another set of English purchasers, Messrs. Twining, Eastwood, Palmer, and others, are grouped on the shores of Ballinakill Bay, and in the vale of Kylemore. Many tenant farmers also from the other side of the channel have settled in the western counties within the last three years. Large tracts have been taken on the Marquis of Sligo's estate by English and Scotch gentlemen, and many other landlords in the west have also induced skilful and enterprising agriculturists to settle on their lands, by granting long and beneficial leases at low rents; but I have

no means of arriving at even an approximate estimate of their number; however, it will be observed, upon examination of the foregoing tables, that the greater extent of English and Scotch purchases is in those western districts where the population has been most diminished, and where capital and improvement are chiefly required, three-fourths of the total average being in Galway and Mayo, and two-fifths of the total amount being invested in the same counties. The immigration, too, is confessedly not of an expulsive character, abundance of unoccupied land, perished from water, or the surface of which has been only scratched in scattered patches for centuries, being in the market, and inviting the advent of a more productive system of culture. The number of English and Scotch purchasers, as well as the amount of their purchases, is also steadily on the increase. Up to January 31st of this year the purchases were one-twenty-fifth as to number, and one-tenth as to the total amount of purchase-money. On referring to these tables, we shall find that up to July 31st the proportion as to number is one-twentieth, and as to amount about one-sixth of the total purchase-money."

When this infusion and substitution of a new race—this Celtic exodus and Saxon immigration—shall have continued long enough and proceeded far enough, a large portion of the anomalies which now afflict Ireland will cease, or be reduced within manageable compass. Her present wretchedness and difficulties all spring originally out of two sources—race and religion. A population consisting of seven million Celts and one million Saxons—seven millions of the conquered and one million of the conquerors—seven millions of dispossessed cultivators fancying, rightly or wrongly, that they were entitled to, and had been wrongfully deprived of, the land held by the single residuary million—might well be difficult to govern. A population—four-fifths of whom looked upon the law as their ruthless oppressor and their natural enemy, who sympathized with the criminal and abetted the crime, who held no oath as binding when the interests of their Church, their race, their party, or their family, could be served by setting it at naught—might well baffle and drive to despair rulers who endeavoured to control and curb them by institutions which can suffice and flourish only among a truth-loving and a law-loving people—by jury trial, of which the very essence and basis is reliance on the word and oath of jurymen and witnesses—by legal technicalities which seem contrived to secure the escape of the guilty—by a constabulary force which must be nearly powerless when not aided by the general sympathy of the community with peace, order, and justice. But when the proportions shall have been adequately changed,—when instead of a population of eight millions—of whom seven millions are Irish, we have to deal with four or five millions, of whom half are Britons or of British extraction, the case will be wholly altered, and our difficulties

will cease as by magic; the remaining aborigines will not only be controlled by, but will take their tone of feeling and opinion from, the more energetic and right-minded fellow-citizens with whom they are intermingled; as they cease to be criminals and outlaws, the law will become their protector and their friend; it will be easy to find witnesses who will dare and wish to speak the truth, and jurors who will be both able and willing to convict according to the evidence; and for the first time the government of Ireland by British institutions will become a matter not utterly hopeless or impossible.

Another source of grievous embarrassment will also be cleared away. The Irish emigrants are nearly to a man Catholics as well as Celts. The Established Church—which, in its actual proportions, was an indefensible enormity when it was the church of one million out of eight—will lose much of its colossal monstrosity when it has become the church of two millions out of four. And if judicious reform should mitigate even this disproportion, it may well be that as the hostility of race dies out under the process of improvement, juxtaposition, and amalgamation, that of religion may also fade away, and the process of conversion which has already set in at the west of Ireland, may continue with accelerated pace. Those who remain may, with changed circumstances, abandon their old religious creed, as we know is the case with a large proportion of those who have sought a new home in a new world. The Irish who have emigrated to the United States are not fewer than two millions: it is calculated that they and their descendants now number about three millions;* the French, Spaniards, and Italians, are estimated

* These are subjects on which it is impossible to speak with absolute certainty. We are pretty *certain* that above one million and a-half of Irish have gone to the States in the last twenty-five years. Professor Tucker in 1830 analyzed the white inhabitants of the Union thus:—

English and their descendants,.....	6,000,000
Scotch,	500,000
Irish,	2,000,000
German,	1,000,000
Dutch,.....	500,000
French,	300,000
Swedes, Spanish, &c.	200,000
	<hr/>
	10,500,000

Another writer, taking the same view, gives the following in 1850:—

Anglo-Saxons,	11,000,000
Lowland Scotch,	700,000
Scotch and Anglo-Saxon Irish,	1,500,000
Celtic Irish,	2,000,000
Welsh,	300,000
German,	2,000,000
Dutch,.....	800,000
French,	1,000,000
Others,	350,000
	<hr/>
	19,650,000

19,650,000

at above one million; many of the German emigrants and their descendants are Catholics; yet the total number of Catholics in the Union did not probably in 1850 exceed 2,000,000.*

We confess we have no fear of the emigration from Ireland being carried too far or continued too long: As soon as the inducements become sufficient, English capital, enterprise, and industry, will flock in to fill any gap that may be made, provided only peace and security be established. Englishmen and Scotchmen would seek Ireland as a field both for investment and for speculation, in preference to more distant lands, if life and property were once fully protected. The want of this security and this protection has hitherto been the curse and privation of that unhappy country. But Government is, we believe, more alive than it has yet been as to the necessity of performing this, its first duty, at whatever cost; and every emigrant ship that leaves the shores of Ireland makes the task more easy. The first effect of this *immigration*, then, will be, to raise the wages of labour: hitherto the scarcity of hands in many districts, consequent on the exodus, has not had this effect, because the capital in the hands of the employers of labour was so miserably insufficient. The labour-market was scantily sup-

While this article was passing through the press, we have received from America, by the kindness of Mr. Ticknor and Dr. Chickering, (to whom we take this means of expressing our acknowledgment,) a number of documents bearing on this interesting question, from one of which (the *New Englander*) we extract another analysis of the American population, evidently made with great care and from the best materials:—

Anglo-Saxons by birth and blood,	15,000,000
African,	3,594,762
Irish,	2,269,000
German,	1,900,000
French, &c., &c.,	499,786

23,263,498

We are satisfied, however, that this writer *under-estimates* the number of Irish, and probably also of Germans. For example, he gives the total number of immigrants, from all countries, from 1790 to 1850, at 2,759,329. Dr. Chickering, a first authority, however, shows them to amount, in the 33 years ending October 1852, to 3,212,386, of whom 1,597,897 arrived in the last five years.

* On this point, however, we cannot speak with positive certainty. There is no official return of the numbers of different religions. The Catholic Archbishop Hughes, of New York, estimated the number of Catholics in 1850 at 3,000,000. On the other hand, the Catholic Almanac, published under the auspices of Archbishop Eccleston, estimates them only at 1,650,000. The only certain fact is, that their own organs and dignitaries lament bitterly the constant falling away from the old faith of both residents and new arrivals. We have heard of another Archbishop who states the number of Catholics at 1,200,000, (the same as ten years ago), whereas they ought by immigration and natural increase to be at least 5,000,000. The *Encyclopædia of Religious Knowledge* published at Philadelphia, gives the number of Catholics of the Union at only 800,000. Again, the *Freeman's Journal* gives a fifth estimate, also a Catholic one, on the authority of a priest, Mr. Mullen, who has lately visited the United States to obtain subscriptions for a Catholic College. He states the number who *ought to be* Catholic (by emigration and descent) at 3,970,000, and the number who *are* Catholic at 1,980,000.

plied, but the labour-fund was scantier still. Hence we have seen the strange anomaly, of a great outcry for workmen, while wages remained at fivepence a-day. The second effect will be a vast increase in the produce of the soil: the old barbarous inefficient modes of tillage will be abandoned, and new ones, at once cheaper and more productive, will be introduced. The early reports of the Poor Law Commissioners stated, that though in Ireland *twice* the number of men were employed per acre, yet that the acreable produce was only *half* what it was in England. When this state of things is rectified, and Irish is assimilated to English agriculture, Irish wages will rapidly approximate to those of England; for the Irish, as we well know, *can* work as hard and as efficiently as Englishmen or Scotchmen, when mixed among them; and directed and stimulated by them. British labour, too, as well as British capital, will flow in to give fresh impetus and introduce a higher standard of exertion. And when the land has become prosperous and peaceful, when wages are at two shillings a day, when labour is at once efficient and well rewarded, and the Poor-House is no longer the only prospect of the peasant, we have no fear that those who then remain will not prefer old Ireland—in its renovated state—to the chances of transatlantic emigration, which by that time may have met with many discouragements. It will be, therefore, with no sorrow or alarm, but, on the contrary, with hope and gratulation, that we shall see the exodus continue at its present rate at all events till the next census—till in fact circumstances have so changed that Ireland has become more attractive than America.

So much for the case of the sister island. Let us now inquire whether the extensive emigration which has set in from Great Britain to the colonies is really such as to afford us any rational cause for alarm, or whether it is not rather a matter for cheerfulness and congratulation. Taking the first half of 1852 as the groundwork of our calculation, we find that the total *yearly* number of emigrants from England and Scotland, (allowing for the Irish who have sailed from Liverpool and the Clyde, and the Scotch who have gone by way of Liverpool,) has reached about 116,000, viz., about 96,000 English and 20,000 Scotch. But the annual increase, or surplus of births above deaths, have been in England, on the average of the five years ending 1848, (the last of which we have the returns by us,) 165,000, or nearly one per cent. on the population. If we assume that the same rule holds in Scotland, the annual increase in *Great Britain* by natural multiplication will be about 206,000. If emigration then continues at its present rate, more than half our annual increase will be exported, *leaving* us, how-

ever, an annual augmentation of our numbers, of 90,000 souls. Let us tabularize the whole case:—

	England and Scotland.	Ireland.	United Kingdom.
Annual Surplus of Births over Deaths,	206,000	...	206,000
Annual Emigration, according to first Six Months of 1852,	116,000	250,000	366,000
Increase of Population,	90,000
Decrease,	250,000	160,000

In other words; whereas during the last decennial period Ireland lost *a million and a half* of her population, in the next decennial period she will have to face a loss of *two millions and a half*; whereas in the last decade our total increase in Great Britain was *above two millions*, in the next decade it will be *less than one million*; and whereas in the last decade the entire United Kingdom *increased* in population nearly half a million, in the next decade it will *decrease* above a million and a half.* The British Isles have reached and passed their maximum—in numbers. Such a result may well startle us, and assuredly demands careful consideration.

Nevertheless we look upon the fact as one of no sinister augury, but the contrary—if we are wise and know how to use the golden opportunity. This, however, we are aware, is not the general impression. Many fear that we shall be unable, in such an altered state of things, to find recruits for our army, or sufficient labourers for our fields, or manageable servants for our households, or cheap and efficient artisans to maintain our manufacturing superiority. Let us look at our prospects in these respects *seriatim*.

And first as to our supply of soldiers. These, it is said, have hitherto been chiefly supplied from Ireland and the distressed districts in Scotland, and it is precisely from these quarters that the emigration is the greatest. *The allegation is not true.* Even

* It is, however, scarcely probable that the emigration from Great Britain will continue quite at the extreme rate of the present year. Last year it was only 78,600 against (apparently) 116,000 this year. The chief increase has been to Australia—stimulated mainly no doubt by the gold discoveries—as will be seen from the following Table. It may well be, however, that the Saxon emigration to Ireland will counterbalance any diminution of that to Australia:—

Total Emigration from the United Kingdom during the first Six Months.

	United States.	British North America.	Australia.	Other Places.	Total.
1847	92,478	86,388	3,448	1,274	183,588
1848	95,651	21,496	7,773	2,161	127,081
1849	132,046	27,691	16,639	2,693	179,069
1850	111,292	20,326	8,564	4,319	144,501
1851	140,336	24,180	8,473	1,871	174,860
1852	136,204	19,453	25,810	1,519	182,986

in the last war it is well known that many of the Highland regiments had comparatively few Highlanders in their ranks. But we have now lying before us returns of the recruits who were inspected in 1845, (an average year,) and we find that of 13,370 7145 were English, 4009 Irish, 2061 Scotch, and the rest Welsh or foreigners. England, therefore, still furnishes more than half, and Great Britain more than two-thirds of our land forces, and nearly all our naval forces.

The total number of British troops may be taken in round figures as averaging 140,000 men—(fewer considerably, we believe, than will in future be found desirable; but let that pass.) The number of recruits annually required appears latterly to have ranged from 10,000 to 20,000—say about 15,000. It is feared that out of a population of twenty-seven millions, (which ours now is)—still more out of a population of twenty-five millions and a half, (which we are assuming it will be in 1861,) we shall be unable to keep up this army, or to procure this number of recruits. But let us look at what we did in 1806 and 1813, when our population was only *eighteen* millions. In those years our army numbered from 234,000 to 267,000 men, besides which we kept 83,000 regular militia constantly on foot, in addition to the local militia, which numbered from 200,000 to 300,000.* The annual wear and tear of the army was then calculated at 15,000 men in peace, and 25,000 to 30,000 in war; and no difficulty whatever was found in raising the number required by voluntary enlistment.† The same facility of finding voluntary recruits continued during the whole period of the war; nor can it in any degree be attributed to want of demand for labourers in agricultural and manufacturing occupations. The very contrary was the fact. During nearly the whole of that period, agriculture was notoriously flourishing, and the demand for labour may be in some degree estimated from the fact that from 1804 to 1814, upwards of 1000 Enclosure Acts were passed, and nearly 2,000,000 acres were brought into cultivation.‡ In the same period our manufacturing industry had also been decidedly though not rapidly on the increase. The *official* value (or quantity) of British produce and manufactures had risen from £22,000,000 in 1804 to £34,000,000 in 1814; and the declared or real value, from £37,000,000 to £45,000,000.§ Now, if under such circumstances, and with a population of only eighteen millions, Great Britain was able to recruit an army of 250,000 men, besides militia, and often to raise 30,000 and 40,000 fresh volunteers every year, we cannot possibly fear that with a population of twenty-six millions, and such numberless

* Alison's History of Europe, x. 172; xviii. 18.

† Porter's Progress of the Nation, i. 156, 171.

‡ *Ibid.* x. 173; xviii. 14.

§ *Ibid.* ii. 98.

inventions for economizing labour,—notwithstanding the enormous increase that has taken place in all departments of industry,—we shall find any real difficulty in keeping up an army 150,000 strong, or in finding 15,000 recruits annually, provided only that we really want them, and are willing to offer them adequate inducements to enlist. It is true enough, no doubt, that with trade brisk, and agriculture flourishing, and the colonies clamorous for hands, we shall not be able to procure soldiers *so cheap* as we used to do: the greater the distress, the easier of course is always the task of the recruiting sergeant. But *it will be a mere question of inducement*—pecuniary or otherwise. Our officers will have to compete with a higher rate of wages and more inviting and numerous occupations and outlets than formerly: they will have to bid higher for their men, either in the shape of pay, of treatment, of promotion, or of pensions; but *the article is still there*, if only we are willing to purchase it at its now enhanced value. An improvement in the condition of our troops, and a material increase in their cost, we may unquestionably anticipate.

Secondly, as to agricultural labourers. It is true that it is principally from this class that emigration has hitherto proceeded, and mainly also from this class that our army is habitually recruited.* Still a little reflection will shew how groundless is the alarm now felt by many, and professed by more, as to the possible insufficiency of the remaining hands for the adequate cultivation of the soil. In the *first* place, we must remind the alarmists, that even if the emigration from Great Britain should continue at its present rate it would still leave us an annual *increase* of nearly 100,000, so that if more hands are annually wanted for agricultural purposes they can be procured. In the *second* place, we may remark, that the rural population in Great Britain generally is at this moment actually redundant, (notwithstanding the inconvenience said to have been felt in some localities at harvest time,) as may be plainly seen, both from the number of able-bodied labourers still wholly or partially dependant on parochial aid†—greatly as this number has of late years been diminished—and still more from the miserably low wages still current in many of our southern counties. *Thirdly*, the number of hands required for the cultivation of the soil appears to diminish rather than increase as the style and efficiency of

* Occupations of Recruits inspected in 1845 :—

Husbandmen, Labourers, &c.,	8,277
Mechanical Trades,	4,083
Shopmen and Clerks,	982
Professional,	28

13,370

† On January 1, 1850, 172,800. On January 1, 1851, 147,500.

agriculture improves. The census returns for 1851 have not yet been analyzed, and those for 1841 were made out in a manner which precluded comparison with any former year.* But if we can trust the returns for 1821 and 1831, there was an actual *diminution* in the number of families employed in agriculture, in England from 773,732 to 761,348, and in Scotland from 130,699 to 126,591; and this diminution took place although 200 inclosure Acts had been passed, and about 400,000 acres of fresh land had been brought into cultivation.† It appears then that we have already more hands than are needed in agricultural occupations; that the number needed is further progressively diminishing; and that if more were needed they could still be had. It is true, no doubt, that when the various crops ripen simultaneously, some difficulty may be experienced—which was not felt formerly—in procuring the extra hands necessary to harvest them; but what does this mean but that *hitherto we have maintained a large population in costly idleness for eleven months in the year, in order to have their labour in the one remaining month*, and that in future we shall not be able to do so—a result which is surely a matter for congratulation in both an economical and a philanthropic point of view. We know well that scarcity or dearth of labour is the great stimulus to the introduction of improved processes and mechanical contrivances; and when the farmer finds that he can no longer have so many hands as he wants, exactly when he wants them, and nearly on the terms which it may suit him to pay, labour will be economized and rendered efficient, reaping machines and thrashing machines will soon come into general use, and new and improved tools will be substituted for those which have so long satisfied that stationary and unenterprising race. That wages will rise in the rural districts there can, we think, be no question; we should be grieved if it were not so: the fact of heads of families receiving only 7s. and 8s. a week, (and that not regularly,) is precisely one of those monstrous evils and anomalies for which emigration is the appointed cure. But it by no means follows that the farmer will suffer in consequence, or that the cost of raising agricultural produce will be enhanced thereby: we believe the contrary will be the result. For not only will the labour of the well-paid man be more efficient and valuable than that of the pauperized and ill-fed rustic, (as is even now found to be the case by the more skilful and energetic farmers of Leicestershire and Lincolnshire,) but the improvements consequent

* The number of *individuals* given in the census returns of 1841 as engaged in agriculture in Great Britain in 1841, was 1,500,000, to which M'Culloch adds 800,000 as engaged in subsidiary trades, making a total of 2,300,000. But we cannot regard these figures as very reliable.

† Porter's Progress of the Nation, i. 52, &c.

upon the necessity of economizing labour will give a stimulus to agriculture which it has long wanted. Moreover, the same operation which makes labour scarce and dear, will make the poor-rates light; and if the opportunity is used as we trust it may be, the heaviest and most irritating burden of the farmer may be removed. He will pay his labourers higher, but will employ fewer of them; his outgoings (in rates) will be much less than now, and his crops will be improved both in quantity and quality.

Thirdly. It is feared that our manufacturing progress will be arrested, and our manufacturing superiority be jeopardized by the enormous emigration from our shores. Hitherto, it is alleged, we have been enabled to keep down the cost of production, to force our productions into every market, and to undersell all competitors, in consequence of the abundant supply of labour which we have been able to command. The whole increase of the rural districts has flocked into our industrial towns; Ireland has poured her superfluous numbers into Lancashire and Lanarkshire, and even Yorkshire has had her share. On the cost of manufacturing production depends the whole question of our successful commercial rivalry with other nations:—if that should be materially enhanced—nay, if it should not be progressively diminished as other producing nations diminish theirs, we shall be defeated in the contest; and already our competitors are everywhere treading close upon our heels. Now, mechanical improvements have gone on and are going on in all branches of our manufactures (unlike the case of agriculture) as fast as avarice or ambition could stimulate our ingenuity; we can hope for no accelerated advance in this line; and in all these improvements our rivals participate as fully as ourselves. The whole question, therefore, has become one of a cheap and abundant supply of labour—precisely the thing which the wholesale exodus you are rejoicing over threatens to destroy.

We will concede at once that the effect of emigration will necessarily be to enhance the general wages of labour, and to diminish the supply, *or rather to prevent those wages falling as they must otherwise have done.* *Pro tanto*, and as far as it goes, it will counteract the operation of the repeal of the Corn Laws, which was, *first*, to equalize (or approximate) the wages of labour here and on the Continent; and, *secondly*, not indeed to lower them here at once, but to make it possible to lower them, if at any future time the relation between demand and supply in the labour market should render such reduction just and necessary. The effect of emigration will, therefore, probably be to keep the rate of wages permanently higher here than in those continental countries which have not our facilities of outlet for their increasing population; and moreover, there can be no doubt that the

rate of wages is one of the most important elements in the cost of manufacturing production. But *it is only one*; and it is precisely that one in which we have never had an advantage—in which we have been always at a disadvantage;—*in despite of our disadvantage in which our manufacturing superiority has been earned and maintained.* Our advantages have been, *first*, in more excellent machinery: this we are fast losing, if we have not already lost it;—*secondly*, in greater concentration; this we still maintain;—*thirdly*, in the greater energy of our people: which diminishes yearly as other nations improve; and *fourthly*, in our abundance of capital and our low interest of money, and the consequent low profits for which our capitalists are willing to work: an advantage which certainly there is at present no appearance of our losing. It is only of late that as foreign competition has become closer and more menacing, and as the hours of labour have been reduced by legislative enactments, that we have begun to look anxiously to the possibility of reduced wages of labour as necessary to enable us to hold our ground. Moreover, it is worthy of especial remark, that our most formidable rivals, the Americans, are precisely the only ones who have *no advantage* over us in the price of labour; and that our most formidable European rivals, the Swiss, are those who have *least advantage* over us in this item of expense.

But again: Is there any reason to fear that the annual increase of our united population *left at home*—amounting, be it remembered, to nearly 100,000—will not be sufficient to supply the demands made upon it by the supposed annual increase of our manufacturing industry? We have no certain knowledge of the actual numbers now employed in the various branches of manufactures in Great Britain;* but the following is Mr. M'Culloch's estimate of the principal ones, and we have no reason to believe it is far from the truth. It relates to the year 1845.

Number employed in the	coal trade and manufacture,	177,000
"	"	Iron, . . .
"	"	Tin, copper, &c., . . .
"	"	Lead (say conjecture,) . . .
"	"	Woollen, . . .
"	"	Cotton, . . .
"	"	Silk, . . .
"	"	Linen, . . .
Carry forward,		1,367,000

* The census of 1841 gives 3,110,000 as engaged in commerce, trade, and manufactures, but this will include all shopkeepers, merchants, &c

	Brought forward,	1,367,000
Number employed in the	Hardware,	275,000
„ „	Leather,	290,000
		1,932,000
Add for sundry manufactures,		68,000
		<hr/> 2,000,000
Add increase for seven years at 2 per cent., say,		300,000
		<hr/> 2,300,000
Number now employed in manufacturing occupations,		2,300,000

Now, we have no accurate means of knowing the rate of annual increase in the number of hands employed in our various manufactures, nor even in the production in any one. It is, however, generally believed, that the cotton trade is that which increases most rapidly, and it is that also whose increase we can most exactly ascertain, as all the raw material used up is imported, and therefore accurately registered. Now, on an average of a number of years, and in round numbers, the quantity of raw cotton imported into Great Britain has increased at about the same rate as the negro population of America, (whence our chief supply is derived,) or three per cent. But, as is well known, both labour and machinery are much more efficient than formerly; a given weight of raw cotton does not require nearly the same number of hands to manufacture it as it used to do. If, therefore, we assume *two* per cent. as the increase in the labour required in the cotton trade, we shall probably be up to the mark; and if we assume that the other manufactures increase as fast as the cotton, we shall certainly be beyond the mark. Now, two per cent. on 2,300,000 persons is 46,000 a year. If, therefore, all our manufactures should increase as fast as that of cotton, and if the cotton manufacture should increase as fast as it has done for the last fifteen years,—altogether they would only require half the annual increase that remains in these islands after emigration has done its worst.*

But further;—is it necessary that our manufactures *should*

* It will, we hope, be borne in mind that we give these figures and calculations only as conjectural estimates, and with a strong impression of the uncertainty of all similar data; but they will at all events aid us in our search after the truth. Many will be startled by the reflection, "if our manufactures have hitherto absorbed only 46,000 a year of our annual increase of 200,000, what has become of the remainder?" We confess our inability to answer this question; we can only observe that whereas we have estimated our manufacturing population to increase at the rate of *two* per cent., our total population has increased at the rate of little more than one per cent. per annum. Our impression is very strong, that 100,000 additional persons every year are quite as many as we shall be able to find occupation for at home, without overstocking still further trades and professions that are already overstocked, and keeping the standard of living at an undesirably low point.

increase in the same ratio as hitherto, or is it likely that they *will*? If indeed England could become, what it has always been her ambition to be—the great workshop of the world ;—if even it were at all probable that she could remain so as much as she is at present,—we might then rationally enough look with some uneasiness upon the expatriation of so large a number of those sons through whom she was to maintain her manufacturing supremacy. But those who are intimate with the condition and history of our industrial progress, have long been aware that these hopes are utterly delusive. It is true that till now we have gone on increasing our production and our exports, because the world has been growing wealthier, our customers have been multiplying, and new markets have been opening to us as fast as old markets have closed,—but this cannot always continue at the same rate as formerly. We have now many rivals, where thirty years ago we had none; we formerly supplied nations which now partially or entirely manufacture for themselves;* we formerly had the monopoly of many markets, where we are now

* The following comparison, taken from the circular (Oct. 1852) of Messrs. Dufay and Co., (quite the first authorities on such matters,) will shew how far other countries are treading on our heels in the cotton manufacture.

Consumption of Raw Cotton by the following Countries—given in millions of lbs.

	1836-7-8.	Per cent. of the whole.	1849-50-51.	Per cent. of the whole.	Rate of Increase since 1837. Per cent.
Great Britain,	1154	5·66	1859	52·6	61
Russia, Germany, Hol- land, Belgium,.....	176	8·6	411	11·6	133
Other continental countries,	449	22·0	711	20·1	58
United States,	260	12·8	551	15·7	112
Total,.....	2039	100·	3532	100·	73

The comparison of 1852 will be still more against this country.

Something of the same process seems to be going on in the wool trade. The Belgian manufacturers are now competing, on more than equal terms, with the Leeds clothiers; and the following figures will give us an idea of the increase of the continental manufacture :—

Export of Foreign and Colonial Wool from Great Britain.

1848,	6,575,000 lbs.
1850,	14,054,000 "

Export of British Wools.

1848,	3,978,000 lbs.
1849,	11,200,000 "
1850,	12,002,000 "
1851,	8,517,000 "

In this year an immense increase has taken place.

First 8 months of 1851,	5,215,000 lbs.
Do. do., 1852,	0,203,000 "

met and undersold by younger competitors. To several quarters we now send only that portion of their whole demand which our rivals are at present unable to supply. A far larger proportion of our production, now than formerly, is exported to distant and unproducing countries. A far larger proportion, now than formerly, is exported to our own Colonies, and our remote possessions. More relatively is sent to Asia and America, and less to Europe. Countries which we formerly supplied with the finished article, now take from us only the half-finished article or the raw material. Austria meets us in Italy; Switzerland and Germany meet us in America; the United States meet us in Brazil and in China. We formerly sent yarn to Russia: we now send cotton-wool. We formerly sent chiefly plain and printed calicoes to Germany: we now send mainly the yarn for making them. All these countries produce more cheaply than we do;—but as yet they are not producing *enough*: we therefore *supplement* them. Partly by our old restriction system, partly by the natural effect of an increasing population, they have been driven from the plough to the loom,—or have been driven to add the loom to the plough;—and henceforth our manufacturing production can increase only, not by underselling or successfully competing with our rivals, but by *the demand of the world increasing faster than our rivals can supply it*. This is more or less the case with all our principal manufactures: it is pre-eminently the case with our chief manufacture, the cotton. The following tables relating to our cotton manufactures will bear out the statements we have just made:—

TABLE I.—*Shewing the Exports in 1840 and 1851, to European producing Countries, now our rivals, of the half-manufactured, the manufactured, and the finished article, i.e., Cotton Yarn, Plain Calicoes, and Ornamental or Finished Calicoes.*

It is referred to COUNTRIES.	COTTON YARN—Lbs.		PLAIN CALICOES—Yards.		PRINTED AND DYED CALICOES—Yards.	
	1840.	1851.	1840.	1851.	1840.	1851.
Italy.....	16,884,000	3,073,000	1,685,000	1,501,000	428,000	439,000
Spain, Holland, Germany, Belgium, &c.....	63,591,000	62,232,000	27,673,000	32,178,000	46,443,000	39,948,000
France.....	76,000	72,000	1,182,000	1,348,000	1,656,000	1,713,000
	80,551,000	65,377,000	30,540,000	35,022,000	48,527,000	42,100,000

This Table shews, that, in spite of a considerable increase of population and consumption, the chief countries of Europe, now become manufacturers themselves, take from us *less* than formerly.

TABLE II.—*Shewing the proportion of our Cotton Exports taken by Europe, Asia, America, and our Colonies.*

	COTTON YARNS—Lbs.		PLAIN CALICOES—Yards.			PRINTED AND DYED CALICOES—Yards.		
	1840.	1851.	Increase per cent.	1840.	1851.	Increase per cent.	1840.	1851.
								Increase per cent.
Europe,	94,013,000	88,295,000	(Decrease) 6	99,347,000	126,838,000	28	107,304,000	94,878,000 (Decrease) 12
Greece, Turkey, Levant, and N. Africa,*	4,630,000	10,239,000	(Increase) 121	41,015,000	82,776,000	101	26,586,000	47,784,000 (Increase) 80
East Indian Territories,	16,014,000	23,772,000	(Increase) 48	115,217,000	284,205,000	147	29,866,000	38,227,000 28
China, Java, Sumatra, &c.,	2,681,000	5,882,000	(Increase) 119	23,015,000	150,563,000	550	6,867,000	33,300,000 385
United States,	265,000	181,000	(Decrease) 32	8,827,000	16,864,000	91	23,246,000	47,263,000 102
S. America and Foreign West Indies, ...	440,000	391,000	(Decrease) 11	99,041,000	150,094,000	53	97,503,000	159,715,000 64
†Our own Colonies, out of Europe,	666,000	577,000	(Decrease) 14	44,966,000	45,627,000	1½	62,093,000	60,705,000 (Decrease) 2
Our own Colonies, excluding the West Indies,	490,000	563,000	(Increase) 15	19,132,000	29,685,000	55	29,600,000	40,280,000 (Increase) 36

This Table shows an actual diminution in our exports to Europe; an increase to more distant quarters, and newer markets, varying from 48 to 550 per cent.; and an increase to our own colonies (excepting the West Indies, which we have wilfully thrown to the dogs) of from 16 to 55 per cent.

* Malacca and Ionian Islands.

† Including West Coast of Africa.

TABLE III.—*Shewing the declared value of British Exports to different quarters of the world in 1830, 1840, 1845, and 1850, and the proportion of total Exports sent to each division.*

Quarters of the World.	1830.	Per Centage.	1840.	Per Centage.	1845.	Per Centage.	1850.	Per Centage.
Europe,	£14,415,000	38	£19,713,000	39½	£22,651,000	39	£23,150,000	33
Greece, Turkey, Levant, &c. . .	1,307,000	4	1,785,000	3½	3,900,000	6	4,470,000	6½
East Indian Territories,	3,270,000	8	6,083,000	12	6,704,000	11½	8,025,000	11½
China, Java, Sumatra, &c., . .	870,000	2	1,900,000	3½	3,026,000	5	2,275,000	3
United States of America, . . .	6,122,000	16	5,223,000	10½	7,148,000	12	14,805,000	21
South and Central America and Foreign West Indies, . . . }	6,122,000	16	6,202,000	12½	6,443,000	11	7,625,000	11
British West Indies,	2,338,000	8	3,575,000	7½	2,789,000	4½	2,213,000	3
Our other Colonies (out of Europe, † }	2,955,000	8	5,718,000	11½	6,311,000	10½	7,674,000	11
Total,	£38,115,000	100	£49,499,000	100	£58,672,000	100	£70,437,000	100

* Including Malta, Ionian Islands, and N. Africa.

† Including West Coast of Africa.

Now, a careful consideration of these Tables will shew, that unless we could continue to extend our distant and colonial markets as fast or faster than we have done of late years, which even the most sanguine among us could scarcely hope for, we should ere long have been driven to seek some other provision for our increasing population than that which our manufactures have hitherto afforded them. We should have been compelled either to *create new markets*, or to lessen the numbers (or forbid their increase) who worked for the supply of foreign markets. The advantage of emigration is that it *effects both these operations*—more especially when directed to our own colonies. It diminishes or tends to check the increase of the number of producers at home, and it augments the number of consumers abroad. It checks production and multiplies markets. It increases the demand and checks the increase of the supply. The weaver, who at home was obliged, in order to maintain himself, to make calicoes for which it was often difficult to find a customer, now goes to Australia and becomes a customer himself. He *consumes* instead of *producing*: a shirt more is wanted, and a shirt less is made. Hence emigration is a double safeguard against those periods of glut and “over-production,” of which we have seen so many in the last twenty years. The following table is interesting, as showing how much better customers for British productions our own colonists are than foreigners. We cannot guarantee its *minute* correctness, because it is difficult to obtain with perfect accuracy the population of different states for particular years; but we believe it will be found a pretty fair approximation to the truth, and it is compiled from the most authentic documents.

TABLE IV.

Countries.	Population in 1849.	Consumption of British Produce and Manufactures in 1850.	Consumption per Head in Shillings.
China.....	250,000,000	£1,575,000	·12
East Indian Territories...	150,000,000	8,023,000	1·06
Europe	230,000,000	23,000,000	2·0
United States.....	23,000,000	14,802,000	12·9
North American Colonies	2,280,000	3,235,000	28·3
Australian Colonies	380,000	2,600,000	137·0

But, finally, even supposing that the emigration from these islands should continue so extensive as altogether to change the conditions of the labour market, to check our manufacturing increase, and endanger our manufacturing supremacy, is not the alarm felt at this prospect rather a consequence of mistaking the means for the end, than well-grounded and rational? No one imagines that there will not always be an ample supply of hands to maintain existing establishments: the evil apprehended is that, by draining off in a different direction the crowds which have hitherto pressed into the labour market, the rate of wages in this country will be materially enhanced, so that our manufacturers will no longer be able to produce as cheaply as formerly, nor therefore to extend as rapidly, or compete with rival nations as successfully as of yore. But what is the object of our manufacturing industry? What hitherto has made the steady increase of that industry a matter of vital and first-rate moment to us? Clearly, to provide employment and subsistence for our advancing population. But if that necessity no longer exist—if that object is provided for in another way—if our working-classes find elsewhere more lucrative employment and easier subsistence,—where, in a national point of view, is the reason for regret or fear? The increased rate of wages, which is the real object of our alarm, can only arise from the improved prospects, the enlarged earnings, the raised condition, of our labouring poor:—it then simply indicates that they have obtained, through another channel, the advantages which it was the aim and purpose of our manufacturing activity to secure to them. The increased rate of wages, which enhances the cost of our productions, and therefore *ceteris paribus*, limits the markets for them, is the consequence of a state of things which makes extended markets, *pro tanto*, less necessary than they were. The moment that an

extension of our manufactures becomes again wanted in order to afford employment for our artisans—either in consequence of their multiplication, or of the new fields of employment closing upon them or being filled up—that moment will wages naturally fall, the cost of production be again reduced, and manufactured articles again force themselves an outlet. This or that manufacturer may be inconvenienced; this or that branch of our industry may be temporarily deranged; great changes may take place in the distribution of employments; but as the sole object of industry is to earn the necessaries and comforts of life—as the sole benefit of brisk and advancing trade is to afford ample and regular reward to those engaged in it,—*then if these objects are already present and attained—as the fact of high wages show that they are*—what more can we, as a people, desire? As soon as the check given, or expected to be given, to manufacturing activity, by scanty and high priced labour, becomes a national evil, labour will immediately and inevitably cease to be—or rather will have ceased to be—either scanty or high priced.

Why, in the vast majority of cases, do wages rise? Because labour has become more productive. Why are hands difficult to be procured for one trade? Because they are in greater demand—more highly tempted—that is, more productive in another. If, indeed, depopulation were going on to such an extent that manufacturing capital, already invested and fixed, were in danger of being thrown idle for want of hands to work it, then an actual loss of property might be deplored. But no one conceives that this will be the case. All that is feared is that we shall not be able to invest *more* capital or find *more* hands (on the old terms) for an increase of our production. But why? Simply and obviously because this capital and these hands find more tempting occupation elsewhere, and in some other line. Instead of producing calico here at 7 per cent. profit, and 10s. a-week wages, they are producing corn or wool at the antipodes, at 20 per cent. profit, and £3 a-week wages.* If the whole of our emigrating capital and labour went to our own colonies, there could be no doubt about the matter: the aggregate com-

* Many, we believe, fear that wages may rise so high that all the manufacturer's profit will be swept away, and he will no longer therefore be able to employ his people. But it is obvious that this can never be the case, (except partially and momentarily.) For it is only the manufacturer's profit that enables him to employ people or to pay wages at all. The moment that profit ceases, or falls so low as to be no inducement to carry on business, he ceases to be able to employ people or to pay them. Employment then immediately becomes *wanted*, and wages necessarily fall, till the margin of profit is again large enough to induce the resumption of production.

munity would be benefited and enriched precisely in the degree in which the new field of industry was more productive than the old one. "But a large proportion of our emigrants go to America." Very true: what is the result? The British capital, which otherwise would have employed them here, partially and with difficulty, will follow and find them employment in more productive occupations, and therefore at a higher rate of profit at the other side of the Atlantic. Merchants are well aware of the enormous and increasing amount of English money now employed in America. At the moment we are writing we have received much curious information as to the extent to which Americans are endeavouring, (and succeeding,) as in 1836, to carry on their business with British capital.

So far, then, from being disposed to augur ill to Great Britain from the extent of this Modern Exodus, we augur from it the greatest and the widest good. We see in it an opening for a splendid and a happy future such as has rarely, if ever, been vouchsafed to an old country. We see in it the solution of most of our social difficulties, the cure of many of our social sores. It will supersede, render superfluous, and scatter to the winds all wild and foolish theories for national regeneration, and render practicable many sane and sober ones. Viewed aright, and used aright, it should be the commencement of a new era, richer, lovelier, nobler, and grander, than any previous epoch of our history. It is one of those critical "tides in the affairs of men, which, taken at the flood lead on to fortune"—one of those glorious opportunities which, if neglected, Providence offers not again; which, if promptly seized, and judiciously and diligently turned to account, need no second advent. Let us briefly hint at a few of the consequences which it will or may produce.

1. It will greatly check and reduce within beneficent limits, if not altogether terminate Irish Immigration into England. For half a century back the western shores of our island—especially Lancashire and Glasgow—have been flooded with crowds of half-clad, half-fed, half-civilized Celts, many thousands of whom have settled permanently in our manufacturing towns, reducing wages by their competition, and what is far worse, reducing the standard of living and comfort among our people by their example—spreading squalor and disease by their filthy habits—inciting to turbulence and discontent by their incorrigible hostility to law—incalculably increasing the burden of our poor-rates—and swelling the registers of crime both in police courts and assizes, to the great damage of the national character and reputation. The abundant supply of cheap labour which they furnished had no

doubt the effect of enabling our manufacturing industry to increase at a rate and to reach a height which, without them, would have been unattainable; and so far they have been of service. In every other respect the Celtic settlers in the west of England have been a source of unmixed evil. We have taken considerable pains to collect a few facts which may serve as a specimen of the extent to which Irish immigration really swells the burden of British pauperism and the returns of British crime. Here are some of them:—

First. We have a carefully prepared document lying before us, from which it appears that in the three years, from November 3, 1848, to October 12, 1851, (omitting a period of nine weeks during which no account was kept,) the number of *deck passengers* arriving in Liverpool from Ireland, was 756,674, of which 531,469 were emigrants and jobbers, and 225,205, or nearly a quarter of a million, were paupers.

Secondly. The number of paupers passed back to Ireland by the Liverpool overseers, having become chargeable on that parish, were in

1847,	. .	15,008		
1848,	. .	7607		
1849,	. .	9507		
1850,	. .	8012	at a cost of	£1386.
1851,	. .	8800	„ „	2120.

In addition to this, the Chairman of the Board of Guardians stated, (in 1851,) that £15,000 was expended annually in relief to Irish paupers.

Thirdly. We have lying before us a report made to the Manchester Board of Guardians by their clerk, Mr. Harrop, from which it appears that while in five years, from 1846 to 1851, the *English* paupers in that union receiving out-door relief, have increased only from 2463 to 2624 families, or less than *seven per cent.*, and in total cost only £7, 10s. a week, the Irish paupers have increased from 427 to 1478 families, or more than *three hundred per cent.*, and in total cost £132 weekly, or £6864 per annum!

Fourthly. The number of cases relieved by the District Provident Society of Liverpool in 1843 and 1844, (before the famine observe,) were 36,403, of which 19,102, or *more than half were Irish.*

Fifthly. The returns of our assize courts do not unfortunately discriminate the native country of the criminals brought before them, but the police courts of Manchester and Liverpool supply us with a standard of comparison.

Return shewing the Number of Persons taken into Custody for Offences committed within the Borough of Manchester in, 1850.

Country of Offender.	Males.	Females.	Total.	Per Centage of the whole.
England, . .	2393	795	3188	69·64
Ireland, . .	778	446	1224	26·72
Scotland, . .	64	29	93	2·04
Wales, . .	32	21	53	1·16
Foreigners, .	13	7	20	·44
Total,	3280	1298	4578	100·00

A Return shewing the Number of Prisoners brought before the Magistrates for the Borough of Liverpool, distinguishing the different Countries to which they belong, during the following Years :—

Country.	1848.			1849.			1850.		
	Males.	Females.	Total.	Males.	Females.	Total.	Males.	Females.	Total.
Liverpool,	2,862	1,607	4,469	3,043	1,776	4,819
English, . .	7,138	3,650	10,788	3,228	1,401	4,629	3,237	1,403	4,640
Irish, . .	5,280	3,514	8,794	4,823	3,301	8,124	4,550	3,432	7,982
Scotch, . .	644	243	887	617	207	824	620	225	845
Welsh, . .	519	265	784	455	231	686	533	261	794
Manx, . .	128	25	153	60	52	112	79	37	116
Foreigners, .	607	23	630	618	25	643	637	18	655
Total,	14,316	7,720	22,036	12,663	6,824	19,487	12,699	7,152	19,851

Sixthly. The number of low lodging-houses in the borough of Manchester (sinks of vice and crime of every sort) are 358, containing 1017 rooms, and 1953 beds, and tenanted, on an average, by 3544 lodgers every night. The persons who keep these lodging abominations are,—

English, . . .	91
Irish, . . .	252
Scotch, . . .	5
Foreigners, . . .	10

358

2. Of the effect which our wholesale emigration will produce on the long depressed agricultural population, we have already spoken. If the advance in their earnings, and the improvement in their position, should, as we trust it will, raise their standard of comfort and of wants, instead of merely inducing them to add recklessly to their numbers, their condition may be permanently and incalculably elevated. The effect will be still more marked on the *classes dangereuses*—the distressed, reproachful, and

criminal classes—of our great towns. Numbers of those tailors, bootmakers, and needlewomen, of whose redundant multitudes and severe sufferings we have of late years heard so much, will no doubt emigrate themselves. Many have already done so, some through Lord Ashley's aid, and some through that of Sidney Herbert's society. Numbers more will emigrate out of the class from which these superabundant handicraftsmen have hitherto been recruited. By the combined operation they will, we may fairly hope, soon cease to be too numerous for the requirements of the community: Fifteen thousand tailors may find full employment where twenty-three thousand could only become slaves of the "sweaters," or crush each other in the internecine strife. We shall no longer hear—at least we ought not—of thousands driven into habitual theft, from the impossibility of finding any honest means of maintenance; of thousands more compelled to seek in prostitution the required addition to the scanty earnings of the needle. That "unrestricted competition," so beneficent in its healthy and natural results, so crushing to the weak when the labour market has become filled up, and yet when labourers persist in crowding into it as before—so hateful to benevolent theorists, who regard it only in its more superficial workings, and its more anomalous results, and have not insight enough, or faith enough, to trace "a blessing in disguise,"—that "unrestricted competition," which it has been of late the fashion so passionately to denounce, will again appear in its true shape, as at once a salutary stimulant, a natural check, a trustworthy and self-operating guide. We shall no longer be inundated with well-meant but ill-digested schemes for setting artificial contrivances to check-mate natural laws, and for purchasing a bureaucratic utopia by the sacrifice of individual free action. Socialism, Communism, elaborate and magnificent schemes of association—*le droit au travail*—will all disappear with that disordered condition of "the demand and supply of labour," which alone gave birth to them, or could secure them a moment's currency; the axe will have been laid to the root of the tree; the evil, which could never have been checked by assaults on its secondary and symptomatic operations, will have been assailed and extinguished at its source.

3. The diminution of our population, and the consequent lightening of the pressure in all branches of industry, will probably go far to rectify what has been pointed out as a very serious evil by our first living political economist, J. S. Mill, viz., the disproportionate and needless numbers employed in the work, not of production, but of *distribution* of the productions of others. The number of retail traders and shopkeepers is out of all proportion to the requirements of society, or the numbers of the producing

classes. There are in many places ten shopkeepers to do the work which one would suffice for—such at least is Mr. Mill's estimate. Now these men, industrious and energetic as they are, do not add to the production, and therefore not to the wealth, of the community; they merely distribute what others produce. Nay more, in proportion as they are too numerous, do they diminish the wealth of the community. They live, it is true, many of them, by "snatching the bread out of each other's mouths;" but still they *do* live and often make great profits. These profits are made, it is obvious, by charging a per centage on the article they sell. If therefore there are *two* of these retailers to be supported by a community, when *one* would suffice to do the work, the articles they sell must cost that community more than need to be the case, and so far the country is impoverished by supporting an "unproductive labourer" too many. Any one who examines into the subject is surprised to find how small a portion of the price paid by the consumer for any article goes to the *producer* or importer, and how large a portion is absorbed by the distributor.* But these retailers are precisely the class of partially educated, shrewd, energetic men, to whom a new colony, as soon as colonization has been made attractive and customary, will be most inviting, and are peculiarly well fitted to thrive there.

4. Emigration will give us such an opportunity as probably no nation has ever yet been blessed with, of retracing our many fatal false steps on the subject of pauperism, and placing, once for all, our entire Poor-Law system on a sound, innocuous, and defensible foundation. A poor-law which taxes the industrious for the support of the idle—the frugal and provident for the sake of the wasteful and improvident—those who have accumulated property by diligence and self-denial for the behoof of those whom fecklessness and self-indulgence have kept poor—is,

* "I think any one who has had occasion to inquire, in particular cases, what portion of the price paid at a shop for an article really goes to the person who made it, must have been astonished to find how small it is. It is of great importance to consider the cause of this. . . . It does not arise from the extravagant remuneration of capital. I think it proceeds from two causes: one of them is, the very great, I may say, the *extravagant portion of the whole produce of the community which now goes to mere distributors*; the immense amount that is taken up by the different classes of dealers, and especially by retailers. Competition has, no doubt, some tendency to reduce this rate of remuneration: still I am afraid that, in most cases, and looking at it as a whole, the effect of competition is, as in the case of the fees of professional people, rather to divide the amount among a larger number, and so diminish the share of each, than to lower the scale of what is obtained by the class generally." "If the business of distribution, which now employs, taking the different classes of dealers and their families, perhaps more than a million of the inhabitants of this country, could be done by a hundred thousand people, I should think the other nine hundred thousand could be dispensed with."
—J. S. Mill: *Evidence before a Committee of the House of Commons*, 6th June 1850.

considered *per se*, a curse to a country, not a blessing—a sin, not a virtue, in those who have enacted it. To compel the man who has kept himself above poverty by abstaining from marriage to maintain the wife and children of the man who by marriage has sunk himself in destitution, is a monstrous injustice—a clear and crying impolicy. One only circumstance can make such a poor-law as ours not unjust as well as not unwise; and that is where it is obligatory upon us as a compensation for previous injustice. Where destitution has been caused by the sole fault or misfortune of the destitute, a poor-law—*i.e.* compulsory charity—is, we conceive, wholly indefensible. But where pauperism and destitution have been caused or stimulated by bad laws, by unjust social arrangements, by the sin of the community in short, then the indigent and incapacitated have a claim on public aid, not as an inherent right, but as compensation for a committed wrong. Now, this unquestionably has hitherto been our case. By our corn-laws, which enhanced the price of food—by our restrictive commercial policy, which curtailed the demand for labour—by our old legislative and administrative follies, which stimulated multiplication, and thus unnaturally increased the supply of labour—by our false doctrines and neglected duties which taught the people error, and did not educate them till they could perceive the truth, on subjects which directly bore upon their social condition—we wronged them, and made ourselves responsible for much of their poverty and incapacity. As far then, and as long, as we had caused or aided their pauperism, we were morally bound to endure it and relieve it. But now we have abjured our blunders, and retraced our steps. We have done much towards educating the people in better habits and in sounder views. We no longer stimulate population by parish allowances regulated according to the multitude of children. We have removed all restrictions on trade, and all taxes on food. The working classes have now, in all respects, fair play. In future,—*i.e.*, as soon as the destitution we have caused shall have died out, and the superabundant population we have tempted into life shall have been absorbed,—the only *claim* of the poor upon the rich for compulsory aid will have been cancelled. And of the mischievous and demoralizing effect of a poor-law, when no longer demanded by justice, nearly every man with whom we need to reason is painfully convinced. As soon, therefore, as the demand for labour has overtaken the supply, and there can, in consequence, be no able-bodied pauperism which is not voluntary and wilful, the moral claim of the able-bodied to relief ceases, and their legal claim should cease also. But with the claim of the able-bodied, the claim of the aged and infirm ceases too. For they are a natural and providentially ordered burden, not upon the commu-

nity, but on their relatives. The able-bodied man ought by the law of Nature, and is enabled by the power which Nature has given him, to support not only himself, but those dependent on him. And the moment ample work and wages are at the command of the able-bodied, that moment does the maintenance of *his* children, *his* sick, *his* disabled, devolve upon him. *That moment emigration has now brought*, or will promptly bring. And if our legislators do not seize the happy opportunity to undo a great evil, to amend an enormous blunder, to repeal a most disastrous, paralyzing, and corrupting enactment, on them, and no longer on inevitable circumstance or on ancestral fault, will lie a terrible responsibility and an ample penalty.

5. The great stimulus that our extensive emigration will give to every branch of the shipping interest must not be overlooked. According to M'Culloch, (*British Empire*, ii. 71,) the registered amount of British and Irish tonnage (above fifty tons, and such vessels only are used in ocean voyages) was in 1845, 2,856,000. It is certainly now not less than 3,000,000. Now, since each ship carrying emigrants to America can make about three voyages in the year on an average—and each one sailing to Australia can make one voyage, out and home, every year; then since the Passengers' Act limits the number to be taken to one person to every two tons; and since, in round numbers, about 50,000 go to Australia and 300,000 to America, we arrive at the fact, that the emigrant business alone gives full employment to 300,000 tons of shipping, or ten per cent. of our whole mercantile navy, independent of the coasting trade.*

6. The effect of emigration in relieving the overstocked professions—the Church, the Bar, the Army, and the Medical Profession—seems at first sight scarcely likely to be so powerful as its operation in other directions. But we are disposed to think that this is merely a question of time and directness. It is very true that comparatively few of those now engaged in, or intended for, the learned professions, are likely to emigrate, or to make good emigrants. On the other hand, some of the most energetic and successful emigrants have been officers of the army and navy. And though many physicians, clergymen, and lawyers may not go out, yet as soon as, under proper management, the colonies become as attractive as they might be made, ought to be made, and, we believe, soon will be made, numbers of those whom the lack of any other eligible outlet now forces into the learned professions, will direct their prospects into the more hopeful channel of colonisation. They will early be taught to

* The demand for vessels for the purposes of emigration is now so great that the passage money to Australia has risen from £12 to £21 per head.

look to that as their line of life, and will qualify themselves for it accordingly; and thus the professions will yearly become less crowded, not because many will leave them, but because fewer will flock into them. In addition to this, the vacancies made by the emigration of the more energetic classes below them, who now monopolize such situations as clerkships, railway officials, &c., will make an opening for them. On the whole, we are inclined to hope that the higher and middle classes may ultimately feel the relief as sensibly as every other section of the community. Even now they emigrate in considerable numbers. We have no means of stating *precisely* how many of these classes are now leaving the mother country, but the number of cabin passengers returned by the Emigration Commissioners give us at least a good approximation. These were, in 1851, 16,616, or just *one-twentieth* of the whole emigration,—of whom 9979 went to the United States, 1111 to the North American colonies, and 2401 to Australia, or *one-ninth* of the total number who went there. Surely these numbers are encouraging enough.

Further, all this emigration causes a certain, inevitable increase of our commerce, by which the upper classes in this country, if they are not too foolish and languid, cannot fail to profit.* Every emigrant becomes not only a customer for what England can produce, but a producer of what England wants and can purchase. Every man who goes to Canada grows corn and wants calico. Every man who goes to Australia sends us wool and takes from us broad cloth. He becomes a purchaser to the extent of £6 or £7, and a producer to probably ten times that amount.

But our higher classes must prepare themselves for this change in the future career which lies open to them: the education which fitted them for the liberal professions will not fit them for the active ones—the education which sufficed while elegant indolence was their destined lot, will be fatally inadequate when they are to strive and struggle in conflict with nature and in competition with their fellows. They must brace up their energies, and prepare and resolve to do their work in life; and then, to them as to all other ranks, the MODERN EXODUS may be an incalculable blessing and a noble opportunity.

* A previous Table (p. 293,) shews that our present emigration cannot fail to increase the demand for our productions less than half a million yearly. Thus—

275,000	Emigrants to United States,	at 13s. a-head,	£178,750
40,000	North American Colonies, at 23s.	„	56,000
50,000	Australia, at £6	„	300,000
			<hr/>
			£534,750

look to that as their line of life, and will qualify themselves for it accordingly; and thus the professions will yearly become less crowded, not because many will leave them, but because fewer will flock into them. In addition to this, the vacancies made by the emigration of the more energetic classes below them, who now monopolize such situations as clerkships, railway officials, &c., will make an opening for them. On the whole, we are inclined to hope that the higher and middle classes may ultimately feel the relief as sensibly as every other section of the community. Even now they emigrate in considerable numbers. We have no means of stating *precisely* how many of these classes are now leaving the mother country, but the number of cabin passengers returned by the Emigration Commissioners give us at least a good approximation: These were, in 1851, 16,616, or just *one-twentieth* of the whole emigration,—of whom 9979 went to the United States, 1111 to the North American colonies, and 2401 to Australia, or *one-ninth* of the total number who went there. Surely these numbers are encouraging enough.

Further, all this emigration causes a certain, inevitable increase of our commerce, by which the upper classes in this country, if they are not too foolish and languid, cannot fail to profit.* Every emigrant becomes not only a customer for what England can produce, but a producer of what England wants and can purchase. Every man who goes to Canada grows corn and wants calico. Every man who goes to Australia sends us wool and takes from us broad cloth. He becomes a purchaser to the extent of £6 or £7, and a producer to probably ten times that amount.

But our higher classes must prepare themselves for this change in the future career which lies open to them: the education which fitted them for the liberal professions will not fit them for the active ones—the education which sufficed while elegant indolence was their destined lot, will be fatally inadequate when they are to strive and struggle in conflict with nature and in competition with their fellows. They must brace up their energies, and prepare and resolve to do their work in life; and then, to them as to all other ranks, the MODERN EXODUS may be an incalculable blessing and a noble opportunity.

* A previous Table (p. 293,) shews that our present emigration cannot fail to increase the demand for our productions less than half a million yearly. Thus—

275,000	Emigrants to United States,	at 13s. a-head,	£178,750
40,000	North American Colonies,	at 28s. "	56,000
50,000	Australia,	at £6 "	300,000
			<hr/> £534,750

look to that as their line of life, and will qualify themselves for it accordingly; and thus the professions will yearly become less crowded, not because many will leave them, but because fewer will flock into them. In addition to this, the vacancies made by the emigration of the more energetic classes below them, who now monopolize such situations as clerkships, railway officials, &c., will make an opening for them. On the whole, we are inclined to hope that the higher and middle classes may ultimately feel the relief as sensibly as every other section of the community. Even now they emigrate in considerable numbers. We have no means of stating *precisely* how many of these classes are now leaving the mother country, but the number of cabin passengers returned by the Emigration Commissioners give us at least a good approximation. These were, in 1851, 16,616, or just *one-twentieth* of the whole emigration,—of whom 9979 went to the United States, 1111 to the North American colonies, and 2401 to Australia, or *one-ninth* of the total number who went there. Surely these numbers are encouraging enough.

Further, all this emigration causes a certain, inevitable increase of our commerce, by which the upper classes in this country, if they are not too foolish and languid, cannot fail to profit.* Every emigrant becomes not only a customer for what England can produce, but a producer of what England wants and can purchase. Every man who goes to Canada grows corn and wants calico. Every man who goes to Australia sends us wool and takes from us broad cloth. He becomes a purchaser to the extent of £6 or £7, and a producer to probably ten times that amount.

But our higher classes must prepare themselves for this change in the future career which lies open to them: the education which fitted them for the liberal professions will not fit them for the active ones—the education which sufficed while elegant indolence was their destined lot, will be fatally inadequate when they are to strive and struggle in conflict with nature and in competition with their fellows. They must brace up their energies, and prepare and resolve to do their work in life; and then, to them as to all other ranks, the MODERN EXODUS may be an incalculable blessing and a noble opportunity.

* A previous Table (p. 293,) shews that our present emigration cannot fail to increase the demand for our productions less than half a million yearly. Thus—

275,000	Emigrants to United States,	at 13s. a-head,	£178,750
40,000	" North American Colonies,	at 28s. "	56,000
50,000	" Australia,	at £6 "	300,000
			£534,750

